





# PLAIN TRACTS

FOR CRITICAL TIMES;

ON THE IMPORTANT SUBJECTS OF

BAPTISM AND REGENERATION,  
&c.

WITH AN ESPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE

OXFORD TRACTS,

&c. &c.

---

THE CHRISTIAN FATHERS.

IGNATIUS, IRENÆUS, TERTULLIAN, &c.

---

BY A UNION OF CLERGYMEN.

---

LONDON:

PUBLISHED BY SMITH, ELDER AND CO. CORNHILL.

1839.

LONDON:  
PRINTED BY STEWART AND MURRAY,  
OLD BAILEY.

## THE CHRISTIAN FATHERS.

---

WE shall not attempt on the present occasion, to make a general appeal to the Fathers, on the subject of baptismal regeneration. But we cannot suffer Dr. Pusey and his allies, to shield their notions of this doctrine, under the sweeping assurance that for fifteen centuries, the *whole Church of Christ*, held only one sense of John iii. 5. and that sense his own. We have in a previous Number thrown out a few hints, by which the reader may perceive the difficulty or danger, of generally expecting to adopt the Professor's canon of interpretation, and have by an exposition of those important words "water and the Spirit," which we conceive more consonant with Scripture, shewn that with respect to such canon of interpretation, it is quite erroneous. We at the same time alluded to the way in which the early Fathers, might easily be led to speak in the way they have done, without warranting us to conclude from their very general language, all, or even half which moderns palm upon them.

The chief point we particularly aim at on the present occasion is the following, *i. e.* to shew *the impracticability of the attempt, to make the instruction given us by the Fathers, a general canon of interpretation.*

If the Professor's interpretation is to guide mankind in their best and surest interests, it must at any rate,—

—*Speak the plain and obvious meaning of Scripture generally, and not the sense of one verse extracted from its context.*

—*It must be a sense both explicit and intelligible, as well as universal.*

—*It must come down to us in a line of evidence, uniform as well as uninterrupted.*

—*It must justify its pretensions, both for consistency and right of authority to the Church of England before it can claim any regard from her members.*

THE PROFESSOR'S POSITION is the following,—“it is confessed that the Christian Church uniformly, for fourteen centuries, interpreted this text of baptism; that on the ground of this text alone, they urged the necessity of

baptism, that upon it mainly they identified regeneration with baptism."

If, as the Professor maintains, the "*whole* Christian church" held the same doctrine with himself, and a part of that church, for one thousand years, be the *Church of Rome*, that church will be a good testimony of the whole; and as *She* has explained herself to believe that baptism "*conveys grace ex opere operato*," the whole church for 1400 years, must have done the same. Dr. Pusey would not, in all probability, wish to release his "*one sense*" from this dilemma, but for the embarrassment arising from the circumstance, that *our church has rejected it*.

In our preceding Numbers we have shewn that spirituality of mind is of the essence of regeneration; that faith and repentance are essentially of the same nature; that the Scripture and our church do not view this holy change as being necessarily confined to baptism; but that where there is sufficient evidence of these graces, regeneration is admitted and salvation promised, though baptism could not be attained:

*That such is likewise the doctrine of the early Fathers of the Christian Church.*

We are aware that this position goes a *step further* than merely to shew that such learned authors as Dr. Pusey, Bishop Bethell, and Archbishop Lawrence, &c. have derived an *erroneous* doctrine from the Fathers; it goes to shew that they have *wronged* the Fathers in so doing. We do not deny that such an interpretation *may* be put upon their language, which has assuredly given too much occasion for it, but, this we contend for, that if an interpretation *MAY* be put upon the language of the Fathers, in consistence with the *Scriptures* and with truth, we are bound by every obligation of regard to truth and character, both their's and our's, to allow them the benefit of such interpretation. *This* is what every *judge* upon the *civil* bench is in the constant habit of doing, where character and opinions are to be decided, and it will reflect disgrace upon the *Christian Church* if justice and equity are allowed to shine in earthly courts with brighter beams than in the "*courts of the house of our God*."

Do not let the reader mistake us. We are not about to become *advocates* for the Ancients, they are already in the presence of an infallible Judge: but neither would we

condemn them rashly or unadvisedly. We are decidedly of opinion that a *stream of Divine truth* does actually flow down, from the circumcision of Abraham, through the Old Testament, into the New: and that our *Saviour* has recognised the essence, changed the form, and transmitted down to us, the *Sacrament* as a genuine admission into "His spiritual kingdom:" and that, ever since our Lord's command became practicable, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature; he that *believeth*, and is *baptized*, shall be saved;" the reception of baptism has become an *ostensible* sign of *faith*; and an essential requisite for the legitimate admission into the Christian Church,—the *society of the "elect and sanctified people of God."*

The above statement we consider to be an undeniable Scripture truth, as we believe was adequately shewn in the Third Number, under the interpretation of John iii. 5. *That* instruction of our Saviour, we view as the *key* to the whole scheme of baptism and regeneration throughout the word of God. And we think that the *earliest Fathers* were perfectly aware of this. For making baptism, therefore, an essential ingredient for an entrance into the kingdom of God, we blame them not, our Lord did the same. But we conceive the error originated in these two points, the one from misapprehending the true bearing of this Divine appointment, the other a marvellous display towards the first Christians, of Divine grace.

1. They perceived that the first believers in Christianity were immediately baptized, as the Lord had commanded, in "Token" that they belonged to him, and *believed* in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost "in whose name they were baptised."

2. They saw also that the general body of those who were thus baptised became actually "*new creatures*" from thenceforth. Their baptism, therefore, became nearly coincident with their conversion, their faith, and their salvation. Their eyes were opened, their understandings were enlightened, their hearts were sanctified, and their whole soul converted from dead works to serve the living God:—they were adopted into the family of God, and by one Spirit, being all baptised into one body, their sins were forgiven them; and under a consciousness of Divine acceptance, they "rejoiced in hope of the glory of God."

Forasmuch, then, as "Christ loved the church and

gave himself for it," forasmuch as we are introduced *into this church* by "*water and the Spirit*," forasmuch as baptism is oftentimes in Scripture placed in *conjunction* with the "*renewing of the Holy Ghost*," as that by which we are "*saved*;" Tit. iii. 5. And may, perhaps, be occasionally put as *inclusive* of the Spirit's operations also, under the figure of the Ark, by which God "*doth now save us*," 1 Pet. iii. 21; we may easily perceive how the corruption of human nature, when inspired instructors were no longer the infallible guides of the church, might turn truth into error, and a spiritual institution into a mere carnal ordinance. Though there be no necessary connexion between baptism and regeneration in their practical working, yet still as—

1. They must, as we have proved, be, by Divine constitution, *both united* in the character of every *true member* of the church of God; and that,—

2. They were, in *fact*, commonly united in the case of the great body of the *first converts* to Christianity:

It became an easy matter to consider them as being *always*, or generally united; at least so generally, that exceptions need not be regarded. And thus another error would be easily introduced; *i.e.* because our Saviour had made them both necessary to enter into his "*spiritual KINGDOM*," that all who *professed* to enter it, did *actually*, as well as *professedly*, enter it: and thus, they considered that baptism *conveyed* regeneration, when the real truth is, that regeneration was required before baptism, which was to be received as its "*token and pledge*."

We shall, before we proceed to the examination of the Fathers, make a remark or two. *First*, that we hope to find among those Fathers of the first ages, nothing whatever, which, when honestly taken according to the rules we have just noticed from Scripture, at all contradicts those rules. And, *secondly*, that when Dr. Pusey and many others try to make the *later* Fathers teach the inseparable connexion between baptism and regeneration, they have done great wrong to those Fathers; and have interpreted their writings in conformity with the *corruptions of Popery*, and not in consistence with the truth and facts of the case.

Here we must inform the reader that we except from the list, in which we often find arranged the names of what are called the *apostolical* Fathers, *Hermas* and *Bar-*



*nabas*. Though we perceive nothing in the writings ascribed to *Hermas*, which may not be made quite conformable to the doctrines we have above laid down respecting the office of baptism, &c., we consider that this writer should either be placed some century, perhaps, later, than the apostle's time, or laid aside as a visionary not worthy of a reference.

To the epistle attributed to *Barnabas* we have more grave objections still. The *scriptural* Barnabas (Acts iv. 36; xii. 35; xiii. 24, &c.) was an *apostle*, accredited by the whole church, and especially by the Spirit of God. For, "as they ministered to the Lord and fasted, the *Holy Ghost* said, *Separate me Barnabas and Saul* for the work whereunto I have called them. So they, *being sent forth by the Holy Ghost*, departed." We have no desire here to be controversial or contentious. But we cannot allow ourselves to believe that an apostle, thus distinguished and thus endowed, the brother, fellow-labourer, and friend of the Apostle Paul, could ever be suffered either to teach or write anything unworthy of his high character and office, which we, after many wise and learned writers, consider the epistle of the pretended Barnabas to be. It is quite in character with after-ages both to forge names and doctrines; and this epistle, or else the name annexed to it, we consider of that order. We shall first notice—

#### CLEMENT OF ROME.

CLEMENT was the person mentioned by St. Paul, (Phil. iv. 3.) as one of his "fellow-labourers, whose names are in the book of life." The only epistle which we admit as worthy of this holy man, is the first he wrote to the Corinthians. This epistle was long read in the churches, and was highly deserving of that distinction. Its date is very uncertain, but may probably be placed, somewhere in the last quarter of the first century of the Christian era. Though we have no recollection that this epistle (which is, perhaps, the only genuine writing of the first century, except those of the apostles themselves, which has descended to our times,) has been adduced to prove Dr. Pusey's assertion, respecting all the Church of God for fifteen centuries, we cannot let it pass without regard. If this epistle do not, it is probable, that *no author* for more than a century to come, will aid Dr. Pusey in his proof.

How lame, then, must be the evidence of that system which begins to halt, in the very first stage of its progress from "India to Great Britain." We do not consider that any very *direct* evidence can be adduced from Clement, either for or against the meaning of John iii. 5, respecting his view of the *efficacy* of baptism. But *indirect* evidence may be produced of no unimportant character.

"Baptismal regeneration," or its opposite, is scarcely ever found alone. There is generally a *system* of doctrines connected with it, and arising out of it. Those, therefore, who oppose baptismal regeneration, are uniformly accused by its advocates, as "having an object in view," and as "coming to the discussion with preconceived systems," — systems, for instance, involving election, predestination, and final perseverance of the saints,—systems, which insist so exclusively upon the Holy Spirit's influences independent of baptism, and on "*Justification* by faith only," as to leave no office for free-will *before*, or for justification and salvation by "good works," *after* baptism. All which sentiments are considered so perfectly inconsistent with baptismal regeneration, and that, being once admitted; they would, as a matter of course, subvert and overthrow it. Many of its advocates, therefore, and especially Archbishop Lawrence, make it a peculiar point, rather to attack *these*, (which they assume to be Calvinistic errors,) than to prove the impossibility of regeneration independent of baptism. If then it shall appear that *St. Clement*, who never mentions *baptism* throughout his whole epistle, does nevertheless teach *those sentiments* which the *advocates* for baptismal regeneration, constantly assert to be subversive of that doctrine, it will be no small argument that Clement did not himself embrace it. We shall just advert to a few particulars. And first to,—\*

ELECTION. "Sedition, (is) altogether unbecoming the elect of God." (§ 1.) "That with compassion and a good conscience, the number of his elect might be saved." (3.) "Let us love our heavenly Father, who has made us partakers of his election," (28.) "It were better that he had never been born, than that he should have offended one of mine elect." (47.)

The following quotation will shew that Clement viewed

\* We quote from Chevallier's Clement.

the doctrine of election, which is scattered over this epistle, as a “doctrine according to godliness,” and as truly productive of it.

“Let us go to him with holiness of mind, lifting up pure and undefiled hands unto him. Loving our gracious and merciful Father, who has made us partaker of his election.” (29.)

Our immediate object, the reader well knows, is not to prove the correctness of the above statements; but Milner has alledged that Clement’s doctrine of election, was “a *primitive* doctrine, and made use of for the promotion of a holy life.” This notion seems strongly implied in the following language;—

“Let us therefore cleave to the innocent and righteous, for such are the elect of God.” (46.)

**JUSTIFICATION.** In speaking of the Old Testament Fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Clement demands,—

“Wherefore was Abraham blessed? Was it not that through faith he wrought righteousness and truth? From him came our Lord Jesus Christ, according to the flesh; from him came the kings and princes of Judah.—They were all glorified and magnified, not for their own sakes or for their works, or for the righteous deeds which they had done, but through his will. And we also being called by his will in Christ Jesus, are not justified by ourselves, neither by our own wisdom, or knowledge, or piety, or the works which we have done in holiness of heart; but by that faith by which Almighty God hath justified all men from the beginning.”

“What shall we do then, brethren? Shall we grow weary in well doing, and lay charity aside? God forbid,—rather let us hasten with all earnestness and readiness of mind to perfect every good work.” (35.)

There is another passage on the same subject in the letter to Diognetus, improperly ascribed to Justin Martyr. “For what else was able to cover our sins but only his (Christ’s righteousness)? How should we, disobedient and impious, be justified; but only in the Son of God? O sweet interchange! O inscrutable dispensation! O benefits surpassing all expectation! That the iniquity of many should be hidden in the just One; and the righteousness of One justify many sinners.” (Note B. in Chev. 494.)

**CHRIST’S SACRIFICE.** “Let us look steadfastly to the blood of Christ, and see how precious his blood is in the

sight of God, which being shed for our salvation, hath obtained the grace of repentance to the whole world." (7.)

REPENTANCE; its universal necessity, and universal efficacy.

"The ministers of the grace of God have spoken by the Holy Spirit, of repentance." "Noah preached repentance; and as many as hearkened to him were saved." "The Lord of all hath declared with an oath, I desire not the death of a sinner, but rather that he should repent: adding—though your sins were redder than scarlet, and blacker than sackcloth,—I will make them white as snow." God has given place for repentance to all such as would turn to Him.—Desiring that all his beloved should come to repentance." (7—9.)

REGENERATION. "Noah being found faithful did by his ministry preach *regeneration* to the world." (7.) And this let it be remembered, without allusion to *baptism*, though he quotes the sentiments and almost the language which St. Paul uses, in Eph. iv. 4, 5. "There is one Spirit—one Lord,—one faith,—one baptism,—one God and Father of all," in these words, "Have we not all one God and one Christ? Is not one Spirit of grace poured out upon us all? Have we not one calling in Christ? wherefore then do we rend and tear in pieces the members of Christ?" (46.)

NATURE and GRACE *in contrast*, is very beautiful in Clement. Through "Jesus Christ—we behold the glory of God shining in his face. By Him the eyes of our hearts are opened: by Him our foolish and darkened understandings rejoice (in) his wonderful light. By Him would God have us to taste the knowledge of immortality." (36.)

ASSURANCE and CONSOLATION in the Spirit's saving operations. "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, how blessed and wonderful, beloved, are the gifts of God! Life in immortality! Brightness in righteousness! truth in full assurance! faith in confidence! temperance in holiness! And all these hath God subjected to our understandings, *i. e.* (our experience). "What therefore shall those things be, which he hath prepared for them that wait for him?" (35.)

All the remark we shall make at present respecting the foregoing sentiments, is, that we should have expected to have found, and no doubt should have found, *baptismal*

*regeneration* running through the pages of this epistle, had it been an *Apostolic tradition*, instead of election, regenerating grace, without notice of baptism, and justification by faith, and not by works done in holiness of heart, with repentance resting on Christ in holy consolation:—doctrines which had they been written in modern times, would have been esteemed Calvinistic and enthusiastical; and calculated expressly to subvert such doctrines as are propagated in the Oxford Tracts.

## IGNATIUS.

IGNATIUS was ordained Bishop of the church of Antioch by the Apostles about the year 70, and was condemned to suffer martyrdom in the year of Christ 107, through the wild beasts, or as others fix it, in the year 116; he wrote seven epistles to the same number of Churches, on his way to martyrdom, excepting the one he wrote to Polycarp, who outlived Ignatius.

There is nothing in the writings of Ignatius which so much as alludes to John iii. 5. “the water and the Spirit,” nor scarcely even to baptism in any shape. The only three or four passages in which he incidentally mentions it are, we believe, the following:—

“—For our God, Jesus Christ, was borne in the womb of Mary, and was baptized, that through his passion he might purify water,” (i. e. to the mystical washing away of sin). Eph. xviii. Chev. viii. 4.

“—Jesus Christ was truly born of a virgin, and baptized by John, that so all righteousness might be fulfilled in him.” (Smyr. 1.)

“—Flee all divisions as the beginning of evils. Wherever the Bishop shall appear, there let the people also be, as where Jesus Christ is, there is the catholic church. It is not lawful, without the Bishop, either to baptise, or to celebrate an Agape,” (i. e. feasts of love, or the holy communion). Jude 12. (Smyr. 8. Chev. 126.)

“—Let your baptism remain as arms, faith as a helmet, charity as a spear, patience as your whole armour.” (Pal. 6. Chev. 135.)

The above, unless we are mistaken, are all the places where any allusion to baptism is made, though a new heart and a holy sanctification of mind are found everywhere. Those passages wherein our Saviour’s baptism is intro-

duced, speak for themselves, i. e. that *his* baptism was our example of perfect obedience, and that the *purifying* effect of baptism was to be obtained, not as the effect of the “water,” but by his “*passion*” or sacrifice, into the faith of which the believer is baptised. Respecting the Bishop’s authority to “baptise,” and the true “catholic church” being only where “Jesus Christ is,” we shall not enter into any controversy, as that would be endless and beyond our design. We shall however observe,—

1. That when our Lord says that “water and the Spirit” must both *unite* in every person who would enter into the kingdom of God,” or the church of Christ, an *ostensible* and *visible church* must exist in order that believers may be baptised into it.

2. That in the time of Ignatius, those officers of Christ’s church, who were his representatives, and stood in his place to preach his gospel, and administer his sacraments, pretty generally consisted of Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons in the churches to which Ignatius wrote, and whose members he urged so vehemently and constantly to unity and submission.

3. That heresies and schisms were becoming very pestilent in the churches; and divisions were causing many to depart from, or expel, the church officers and to apostatize from the true faith of it. For hitherto the visible church was properly but one.

4. Any person, therefore, who should forsake those holy men of God, whom the Apostles had appointed over them in the Lord, and set up a separate interest for themselves, would be considered by Ignatius as baptizing in their “own name,” and into an unauthorized assembly, and not into the church of Christ. “For without these (Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons) he says, there is no church.”—(Tras. 3. Chev. 96.)

5. The controversy, which in Cyprian’s time became so great a cause of mischief, whether persons baptized by heretics and schismatics should be re-baptized on their return to the church of Christ, does not appear to have existed in the days of Ignatius; but the seed-plot of those subsequent evils seems to have now taken place.

6. It also seems pretty evident that *lay* and *female* baptism, which was afterwards practised in the church, had not in the time of Ignatius been allowed or done. Hence we may infer, that such importance and necessity

of baptism to *salvation* had not yet begun to deform the doctrine of Christ's *church*, though to be "born of water and the Spirit," was always necessary to "enter into" it.

The reference made to *baptism*, in connexion with faith, love, and patience, as the Christian's "armour" undoubtedly holds out to us the *profession* made at baptism, and the holy aid which the believer expects from his gracious Saviour. He, in his profession, is made like unto Christ, "that as he died and rose again for us, so should those who are *baptised*, die to sin and rise again unto righteousness, continually mortifying all their evil and corrupt affections." His baptism exhibits this, requires this, expects this. Ignatius was a glorious example of its reality. *His* doctrines were precisely the same with those of *Clement*, but more strongly expressed.

"Ignatius, who is also called Theophorus, to the worthily happy church of Ephesus, in Asia, blessed in the majesty and fulness of God the Father, predestinated before the world to be perpetually permanent in glory, immovable, united, and elect in the genuine suffering by the will of the Father and of Jesus Christ our God, much joy in Jesus Christ, and in his spotless grace."—(Mil. vol. i. p. 170.)

Thus, Milner justly observes, were the truths of the gospel retained in their purity in these churches from the period of St. Paul's labours, to the martyrdom of Ignatius, a space of more than fifty years.

We cannot refrain from one or two more allusions to the animated instruction of Ignatius, because they so directly confront some dogmas associated very closely with baptismal regeneration. One refers to the doctrine, experience, and exhortations of the ancient *Jewish Church* of God; another to the *forgiveness*, the ready forgiveness to all backsliders and grievous offenders, when they should return in *repentance* to the church again; and the last in proof that true *faith* will produce *holy* conversation, while want of it never can.

"Be not deceived with heterodox opinions, nor old unprofitable fables. For if we shall live according to Judaism, we confess that we have not received grace. For the divine Prophets lived according to Jesus Christ. How can we live without Him, whose disciples even the Prophets were, and in spirit expected him as their teacher. For Christianity does not believe in Judaism, but Judaism in Christianity."—(Mil. 179.)

“ My brethren, I am greatly enlarged in my love towards you, and in my great joy I would establish you ; yet not I, but Jesus Christ, in whom being bound, I fear the more as yet being imperfect. But your prayers to God, shall make me perfect that I may attain to that portion which by God’s mercy is allotted unto me : fleeing \* to the gospel, as to the flesh of Christ, and the Apostles, as unto the Presbytery of the church. Let us also love the Prophets, forasmuch as they also proclaimed the coming of the gospel, and hoped in Christ, and waited for him, in whom believing also they were saved, in the unity of Jesus Christ, being holy men worthy of all love and admiration, who have received testimony from Jesus Christ, and are numbered in the gospel of our common hope. But if any one teach you the Jewish Law, hear him not, for it is better to receive the law of Christ from one that is circumcised, than the law of the Jews from one that is uncircumcised. But if either the one or the other do not speak concerning Jesus Christ, they seem to me but as monuments and sepulchres of the dead, upon which are written only the names of men.”—(Phil. 5, 6; Chev. 115.)

“ Where there is division and strife, God dwells not. But God forgives all that repent, if they return to the unity of God, and the council of the bishop.”—(To Philad. 8. Chev. 116.)

“ They that are of the flesh cannot do the works of the Spirit ; neither they that are of the Spirit the works of the flesh. As also faith cannot do the works of unfaithfulness, nor unfaithfulness the works of faith.” (Chev. 78.) “ Flee, therefore, these evil scions, which bring forth deadly fruit : of which if any one taste, he shall presently die. For these (the docetæ) are not plants of the Father ; for if they were, they would appear to be branches of the Cross, and their fruit would be incorruptible.”—(Chev. 100.)

Eminent, however, and apostolic as those fathers were, and however well worthy of their acquaintance with the

\* Le Clerk well observes, that Ignatius specifies, in the first place, the *scriptures* of the New Testament, as his refuge : (as to the flesh of Christ, the life of the soul, not to the sacrament merely as such) : and in the second place, those of the Old Testament, as confirmatory of the New.

He ascribes also the salvation of the prophets to their faith (as the Church of England also does).—Chev. 114.



immediate disciples of the Lord, they shew even in these epistles such imperfection and mistake as prove them to be not inspired. *Clement's* belief in the fable of the Arabian Phoenix rising out of her own ashes, though commonly credited in his days, was not the faith of St. Paul, nor a fact brought by him to illustrate the resurrection. And *Ignatius'* notion respecting the angels being saved only by faith in Christ, though held by others as well, is evidence not only that the author was not inspired, but that the earliest, and most holy and correct of the Christian Fathers, cannot be implicitly followed in every point: and it is a warning to us, that after-ages may discover errors and correct them even in the writings of those whom they look to as guides.

POLYCARP, another Apostolic Father, whose short epistle to the Philippians is all of his writings which has come down to us, writes much like his brother Clement; as a man filled with holiness, derived from the Spirit of God, through the righteousness and grace of Christ, by whom men are saved, and not by their works. But not a sentence about *baptism* or its *regenerating efficacy*. Though short, it abounds with quotations from, and recommendations of, the *scriptures* upon the subjects of "faith, holiness, peace, long-suffering, and joy in chains," which he calls the "crowns of those who are chosen of God and our Lord."

We have now done with the *Apostolic Fathers*; so called, because they lived in the time of the apostles, and were well acquainted with their persons and doctrines, were appointed to their respective situations by them, and imbibed a very great measure of their spirit, principles, and character. They formed, indeed, the *connecting link* between the inspired apostles, and the less favoured portion of Christ's kingdom. Though inspiration was not afforded to the church, other than to the apostles, miraculous gifts were still not uncommon. Yet how little did those holy men make of them, compared with "the excellency of the knowledge of Jesus their Lord." They scarcely ever allude to them. But Christ, and Him crucified, salvation by his blood, sanctification by the Spirit, and holiness the only way to heaven, was their all in all. The attentive reader cannot but observe how greatly the writ-

ings of these Fathers tend to elucidate the controversy respecting baptismal regeneration, and the assertions of its advocates respecting, (John iii. 5.) “water and the Spirit.” We may observe—

1. That *these* are the Fathers of all others, upon whom we must depend for the true *doctrinal stream of traditional instruction*, both about baptismal regeneration, and the meaning of John iii. 5., upon which our opponents assert that the Fathers, and the church of Christ universally, built that doctrine for fifteen hundred years.

2. But that *these Fathers* have not so much as even *mentioned* either that doctrine or its assumed evidences.

3. The inevitable conclusion, therefore, is utterly destructive of Dr. Pusey’s *chain of argument*, in tracing up his “one sense” of baptismal regeneration, and the evidence for it founded on (John iii. 5.) “water and the Spirit,” to the *apostles* themselves. We say this conclusion is inevitable. For—

*First*, We have seen the strongest reason to believe that these Fathers *themselves* held no such notion, because they not only never advocate it, but teach from end to end, such doctrines as its advocates always admit to be destructive of it. But—

*Secondly*, Their defect in not alluding to it, or teaching anything whatever which implies it, *cuts off* beyond recovery all VERITABLE TESTIMONY that such doctrine was *ever taught* by Christ or his apostles. Let the reader regard this point well, and he will see that no mathematical demonstration can be more complete. We have examined the holy *Scriptures*, and have found that man must be born of “water and the Spirit,” in order to “enter” into the church of Christ; but that “water and the Spirit,” may be, and must be, by Divine requirement, separated in their operations: and that the regeneration of the Spirit is always demanded before the believer is baptised. And now we have examined the Fathers, the *only* Fathers, whose character and writings directly and immediately unite with the apostles, and their conduct and writings; and we find that they are precisely as far from proving Dr. Pusey’s point as the Scriptures themselves are. Yea, that their whole evidence, as far as it applies, bears exactly in *opposition* to it.

Thus, then, the evidence against Dr. Pusey is clear.

He cannot *reach* the apostolic doctrine which he insists upon, without he reach it either through the medium of their own writings, or through the writings of those Fathers, who alone were connected with them. But, forasmuch as there is *no such* doctrine in any of them, no such doctrine can Dr. Pusey find!

Should any one still insist that, though neither the *apostles* nor their *immediate* successors, the apostolic Fathers, have *recorded* this doctrine, yet it may be traced up to those who immediately *followed* those Fathers, and that we might receive it orally through them. To this representation we shall oppose two things;—

1. It is the rank root of *popery itself*, from which *any* thing whatever may be propagated.

2. It is exactly the ground which Dr. Pusey explicitly *renounces*: while he rests his entire system upon the unbroken chain of evidence *recorded* from the reformation to the apostles themselves. More of this under *Irenæus*.

JUSTIN MARTYR, who was born about 100, wrote his Apology in 150, and suffered martyrdom about 163, A.D., for the religion of Jesus Christ; he was born a Gentile, was a learned man, and lived and died a philosopher. The Fathers we have previously spoken of, wrote to *Christians*; Justin to the *Gentile* rulers. In this apology he defends the Christians, and gives an account of their general principles, objects, and mode of worship, and how they were initiated into their religion, on their deserting heathenism. He says—

“We will state in what manner we, having been created anew in Christ Jesus, have dedicated ourselves to God.—As many as are persuaded and believe that the things which we teach and declare are true, and promise that they are determined to live accordingly, are taught to pray, and to beseech God with fasting, to grant them remission of their past sins, while we also pray and fast with them. We then lead them to a place where there is water, and there they are regenerated in the same manner as we also were: for they are then washed in that water, in the name of God the Father, and Lord of the universe, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit. For Christ said, “except ye be born again, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of Heaven.”\* He quotes also the

\* John, iii. 3—5.

prophet Isaiah as having “written in what manner they who have sinned and repent may escape from the punishment of their sins. For thus it is said, ‘wash you, make you clean, put away the evil from your souls; learn to do well, &c.—Even if your sins were as scarlet, I will make them white as snow.’”\*

And in the next section he proceeds\*—

“The apostles have also taught us for what reason this new birth is necessary. Since at our first birth, we were born without our knowledge or consent, and by the ordinary means, and were brought up in bad habits and evil instructions, in order that we may no longer remain the children of necessity or of ignorance, but may become the children of choice and judgment, and may obtain in the water the remission of the sins which we have before committed, the name of God the Father and Lord of the universe is pronounced over him who is willing to be born again, and hath repented of his sins; he who leads him to be washed in the laver of baptism, saying this only over him: for no one can give a name to the ineffable God. And this washing is called illumination, since the minds of those who are thus instructed are enlightened. And he who is so enlightened is also baptised in the name of Jesus Christ, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and in the name of the Holy Spirit, who by the prophets foretold all things concerning Jesus.”† (Sec. 80.)

In the 85th section Justin adds, “We then, after having so washed him, who hath expressed his conviction and professes the faith, lead him to those who are called brethren, where prayer is made for the illuminated, and for the whole body of those who ‘have learned the truth,’ that all may lead godly lives, and keep the commandments, so that they ‘may attain to everlasting life.’ They conclude with a kiss of charity and the reception of the holy communion.”

He makes reference to the same subject in some other places: but these are the chief and the most explicit.

In reviewing these statements we consider that we shall find little difficulty in reducing them to a genuine scriptural standard, by fairly attending to the circumstances of the case.

\* Isa. i. 16—20.

† Chevallier, p. 264—6.

We have here a sincere Christian and a philosopher writing an apology to heathen emperors and senators, who persecuted the Christian church without evidence, or even suspicion of crime. The introduction, therefore, of their modes of faith and practice cannot be expected to be other than general, and in no sort intended to convey the precision of controversial argument, which to them would have been unintelligible and useless. Viewing Justin's description of baptism, therefore, with due candour, we shall be able to understand its true character.

1. In the first place we may remark in *what sense* he here uses the phrases "regenerated," or being "born again," on the meaning of which the whole controversy hinges. And as this is the *first* description we meet with in the Christian church, since the apostles' days, we must see if it will properly bear our Saviour's axiom, "born of water *and* the Spirit:" for on this *compound* qualification, *this* new birth consists. To be "born *again*," or "born from *above*," or "born of the *Spirit*," is a purely *simple* act, as we have largely proved in the First Number. It conveys that *spiritual life* to the soul which is necessary to, and which always brings *salvation*. It has no absolute or necessary connexion with baptism, in its formation, being the pure work of God upon the soul, through his divine word: and is always required in the Scriptures, in order for persons to be baptised. This rests on John iii. 3. and similar texts. This spiritual life is described by the "*inward* and spiritual grace;" and is therefore most properly and scripturally termed, the "*new birth*."\* But our Saviour's *further* description, in John iii. 5. embraces more than this. It has a further office to perform; *i. e.* to *ingraft* this new-born spiritually minded man into the "kingdom, or church of God." That birth therefore is a compound; and consists of being "born of water *and* the Spirit."† The *simple* act unites the believer to Christ: the *compound* one, unites him with the spiritual church of Christ, or to such as "shall be saved." These two are quite distinct and yet essentially, in a spiritual sense only *one*. One spiritual birth going before baptism ("born again") which fits the person for the communion of saints

\* John, i. 13.—iii. 3. James, i. 18. 1 Peter, i. 23.

† John, iii. 5. Matt. xxviii. 19. 20. Mar. xvi. 16.

in earth and heaven : the same spiritual birth followed by baptism, gives the compound birth of our Lord's doctrine, (John iii. 5. "born of *water* and the *Spirit*," ) which is necessary to "enter" into the church of Christ, or "the kingdom of God."

Forasmuch, then, as a man's pretensions to the spiritual birth of the gospel, and to faith in Christ Jesus, can only be recognised by his leaving his heathenism and uniting himself with the spiritual kingdom of God by baptism, it is easy to perceive to which of these states regeneration, in the primitive church, would be applied. And it is easy also to perceive how readily the *spiritual* birth might be overlooked, otherwise than as connected with baptism; and indeed, how it was overlooked, and would have been almost forgotten, had not the urgent case of martyrs, and that of the dying thief, held it in remembrance.

*Justin*, therefore, we see ascribes the *regeneration* of the new Christian converts, to their being "*washed in water*." And indeed their compound ecclesiastical birth was not duly complete till then. They were spoken of as "created anew in Christ," *before* they thus "dedicated themselves to God."

2. That "*spiritual* regeneration" (meaning thereby the "inward and spiritual grace," a "death unto sin and new birth unto righteousness;" or, as Hooker calls it, "the infused divine virtue of the Holy Ghost, which giveth to the powers of the soul their *first* disposition towards future newness of life," ) (B. 5. §60), was supposed by Justin, in this description of dedication to God, to go *before* baptism, is certain. For otherwise, the being "born of the *Spirit*" will be entirely *excluded* from his system altogether, for the work of the Spirit, *as such*, is never mentioned separately in the whole process. But it is necessarily included or implied in being "*created anew*" by Christ,—in their *renunciation* of heathenism or Judaism,—in their "*conviction*" that they were previously "without hope, and without God in the world,"—in their determination, in future, to live godly in Christ Jesus,—in their being willing to be baptised in the faith of the Trinity,—and in their joining the church of God, in order that, by a "godly conversation" they might "attain to eternal salvation," which was to be found in no other way.

3. The calling this "washing *illumination*," and the

reason given, viz. because the “minds of those who are thus instructed, are enlightened,” by that instruction; and that he who is “enlightened is baptised,” implies that this process belongs exclusively to *adults*, converted from Judaism or Paganism to Christianity. And such is the genuine proceeding in *Scripture*. “I send thee to the Gentiles to open their eyes, and turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God.” “Ye were sometimes darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord: walk as children of light.” “The eyes of your understanding being enlightened:” but no truly “enlightened” man would ever think of ascribing this “illumination” to baptism, and not to the Spirit working by the truth believed.

4. In the eighty-sixth chapter he describes the eucharist in much the same spiritual manner as our church does; only with less particularity, and he tells us that no one may partake of it unless he truly “believes,” and is washed in the laver which is appointed for the forgiveness of sins, and unto regeneration, and lives in such a manner as Christ has commanded.” All this, again, is perfectly agreeable to our Lord’s promise to his disciples, “he that believeth and is baptised shall be saved,” because Justin has connected, as the *Scripture* does, *believing* with being *baptised*, and *these* (faith and baptism) are indeed “*appointed* for the *forgiveness of sins*.” But baptism alone is nowhere so appointed in *Scripture*: and for “regeneration” also, as before explained, being part of it. A few remarks here may prevent error, and shorten our discussion hereafter. Then—

1. If baptism, as we have seen, was, and is an essential part of *this* (call it) “ecclesiastical” regeneration, *Justin*, &c., did right, in not applying the terms regenerated, &c., till persons were baptised; and in so applying it, when they were baptised.

2. *This* error, and thence the error of all, perhaps, arose from not duly distinguishing between John iii. 3 and 5; or, between being “born from above,” and of being “born of water *and* the Spirit.” They were *both* necessary for admission into Christ’s church; but *not* absolutely, only “*generally*,” necessary for admission into *heaven*.

*Justin* seems, we conceive, to have overlooked this essential distinction, because he *compounds* the two verses in John iii. 3, 5, and connects the qualification of the

third verse with the exclusiveness of the fifth; and even then exchanges Christ's words for his own, and says, "Except ye be born again, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven;" which, though perfectly just, does not *reach the point*, but leaves out of notice, being "born of water and *the Spirit*," entirely: thus exactly escaping from Dr. Pusey's *catena* of testimonies to the "ONE SENSE" of "WATER AND THE SPIRIT;" for he has not so much as quoted them, or professedly explained them at all, so that he does not expressly connect the Spirit in any way with baptism.

Thus, then, we have arrived at 163 A.D., or more, and have not found a *vestige* of testimony in Dr. Pusey's favour. And especially, let the reader mark, NO ONE has hitherto applied John iii. 5, "*water and the Spirit*," to the case of INFANTS; to whom Dr. Pusey, &c., assert that it applies *directly and universally*.

3. The Fathers soon began to neglect all possibility of regeneration to persons who were not baptised; and thus got themselves into difficulties. That Justin held that opinion does not appear. That he held an *inward spiritual work* of God upon the soul, we have seen. If he had confined regeneration to the baptised, we should the less wonder, since we find him introducing, with his philosophy, several errors, unknown before in the Christian Church; such as the origin of demons from the connexion of angels with the "daughters of men," (Gen. v. 2): and the "self-moving power" in the will of man, which Pelagius perfected afterwards.

4. It appears quite demonstrable that Justin did not CONFINE his notion of "*washing*" to the baptism by water, simply, unless we consider him to be so loose an interpreter of Scripture, as to deserve little regard in that capacity: for he expressly refers to Isaiah i. 16—20, as being a prediction by the prophet of the "*washing of baptism*." Now, it is obvious that the *whole* of Isaiah's remonstrances in those verses, and his advice, have especial reference to *moral* washing, and putting away of "sin from before the eyes of God:" or, as Jeremiah, (iv. 14,) "Wash thine heart from wickedness:" or, as St. James (iv. 8) writes, "Wash your hands, ye sinners, and purify your hearts, ye double-minded." Nor can we admit that Dr. Pusey's extracts from Justin's second apology (50.) weakens this view of his sentiments in the least.



“Baptized, we are enlightened—enlightened, we are adopted as sons—adopted, we are perfected—perfected, we are immortalized.” “And baptism is called enlightening, because thereby we are admitted to gaze upon that holy and saving light:” the “*saving* light” is the “knowledge of the glory of God in Christ;”—to “*know* the only true God and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent.” This, and this alone, is “*life eternal*.”

5. We have seen no evidence whatever, hitherto, for the outrageous, anti-scriptural, and destructive sentiment of Dr. Pusey, which makes baptism to “*convey*” regeneration. We have admitted that baptism, ecclesiastically taken according to our Lord’s words, “water and the Spirit,” is a *part*, though the last, and infinitely the least part of that regeneration. It, therefore, properly completes or finishes the amount of qualifications, being itself the “outward and visible sign of the inward and spiritual grace” which is gone before, under “repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ.” But forasmuch as baptism is the *last* ingredient in the required character, it would be senseless to consider it the *cause* of that which was had *before*.

This is the grand error which *Antichrist* began pretty early to introduce into the Christian Church. And when the “sign” was once allowed to “*convey*” the thing signified, the “inward and spiritual” grace soon began to dwindle and die.

## IRENÆUS.

This Father was a disciple of Polycarp, the disciple of the apostle John. We do not find in the writings of Irenæus, which have descended to us, anything material expressly upon the subject of baptismal regeneration: nor do we find him quoted by Dr. Pusey and the advocates of that side of the question, to prove their essential point respecting the interpretation of John iii. 5, “*Water and the Spirit*.” But Irenæus is referred to as sanctioning *traditionary* interpretations of Scripture. The *general* subject of Tradition, we shall leave to younger writers, whose health, and habits of reading, render them more adequate to so extensive an undertaking. But we cannot allow our special discussion to pass by without some notice. Tertullian, Pantænus, and Clement of Alexandria, as well

as Irenæus, all belonged to the second century, and died in the third; but Irenæus alone had particular acquaintance with Polycarp, who was the last of the apostolic fathers; and is relied upon as a great father of tradition. We have long ago seen that Dr. Pusey's system is entirely suspended upon his ability to trace *his* meaning of John iii. 5, "Water and the Spirit," quite up to the *apostles* themselves. We have shewn *his failure*, both as it respects the *apostles* and the *apostolic* fathers. The only chance which now remains for him,—to prove even the shadow of a tradition, rests with our present writer. If Irenæus fail him, all fail him herein.

1. Then, does Irenæus tradit from the mouth of Polycarp, anything about John iii. 5, "Water and the Spirit?" No, nothing whatever. He speaks of "water" sometimes, as Justin does, as regeneration; but nothing further. No explanation, no tradition respecting it.

We admit that Irenæus says, "Baptism, which is our birth unto God," (as Bingham quotes him, 481.) "is to be administered to children as well as to adult persons. For," says he, "He came to save all persons by Himself; all, I say, who by him are regenerated unto God, infants and little ones and children, and youth and elder persons. Therefore He went through the several ages, being made an infant for infants, that He might sanctify infants," &c.

This is, we believe, the first instance in which infants are referred to by the Christian Fathers. But Irenæus has various passages in which he speaks of grace, the operations of the Holy Ghost, and of salvation, *independent of baptism*. In lib. v., cap. 11, he comments on 1 Cor. vi. 9—11: "He (the apostle) most clearly shews by what things man perishes, if he should persevere to live after the flesh;" and again, by what he is saved. "Those things which save," he says, "are the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Spirit of our God." In referring to 1 Cor. xv. 49, "If ye have borne the image of the earthy," &c., he adds, "This is like that sentence, 'And such were some of you; but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God.' When, therefore, have we borne the image of the earthy? Even when those forementioned works of the flesh were done by us. But when, again, (bear we) the image of the heavenly? Even when, as he says, ye are

washed, believing in the name of the Lord, and receiving his Spirit. But we are *washed, not as to the substance of our body*, nor the image of the creature, but as to our *old vain conversation*."

2. Was he likely to have heard the opinion of the apostles at the mouth of Polycarp? Yes, beyond doubt: because when he reproved his former acquaintance, *Florinus*, who once professed the true faith, and had now declined, he says, "These doctrines—*those* who had walked with the *Apostles* did not *deliver* to you. I can mention the very spot in which *Polycarp* sat and expounded;—how he described to us his converse with *John*, and with the rest of those who had 'seen the Lord;' how he related to us their expressions, and what things he had *heard* from them of the Lord, and of his miracles and of his doctrine. As *Polycarp* had received from the *eye-witnesses* of 'The Word of Life,' HE TOLD US ALL THINGS AGREEABLE TO THE SCRIPTURES. These things are written on my heart;—and I can witness before God, that if that blessed apostolical presbyter had heard any such thing (as you teach), he would have cried out, and stopped his ears, and left the place."—Milner, 300.

3. In disputing also against the heretics, who pretended *tradition* for their falsehood, he reminds them how some barbarous nations had received the truth from the "mouth of those to whom the Apostles had committed the care of the churches, and through them had believed in Jesus without paper or ink, having the doctrine of salvation written on their hearts by the Holy Ghost, and faithfully keeping up the doctrine concerning one God, the Creator, and his Son Jesus Christ. These would immediately stop their ears at heretics and flee—their blasphemies."—(Ibid. 296—7.)

Thus Irenæus testifies the use of *tradition* in the absence of the written word,—reproves its abuse when contrary to the Scriptures,—speaks of the Holy Ghost writing Divine truth on the heart;—but not one word of tradition about "water conveying the Holy Ghost," as Dr. Pusey insists upon it.

4. We cannot help recording one of the earliest and most deplorable effects of a professed *traditional* observance, not among heretics, but in the christian church; and one in which *Irenæus* was for the time very successful as

a moderator. The Asiatic churches differed from the Roman, respecting the day of celebrating Easter, in commemoration of our Lord's suffering. The former professed to derive their custom from the *Apostles* JOHN and PHILIP; while Rome, on the other hand, pleaded the example of ST. PETER and ST. PAUL. Thus fortified by an appeal to practices handed down to them by tradition, each contended so sharply for the priority, that they divided one from the other, and even proceeded to excommunication. Hence, through their fiery zeal, in adhering to a *pretended tradition*, the charity of the Church was, for some centuries, nearly annihilated. We say *pretended*, for how could it be otherwise, unless the apostles themselves were divided in their practice and instruction. This supposition, however, would destroy the ground of all appeal to *Apostolic* tradition.

*Examples of Regeneration independent of Baptism.*

1. "*Clemens Alexandrinus*," speaking of the injunction in the Law of Moses, as compared with what our Saviour says on the subject of the adulteress, (Matt. xix. 9,) uses the term *παλιγγενεσία* and its kindred language in the sense of being "*born again* by her repentance and conversion," and not by baptism, as our authors contend.

2. "*Eusebius*," speaking of the apostle *John's* restoring to the Church one of his disciples, who had deserted, and become the leader of a band of robbers, "calls the young man's repentance and restoration to the church, a great example of *regeneration*." A few lines above, he speaks of the same young man, where, as the Bishop observes, he "evidently calls his conversion a *new birth*."

3. In another passage, referring to the restoration to the faith of some martyrs at Lyons, who through fear of death had drawn back for a time, he speaks of their return, as that of *new born* babes into the Church of God.—(Bp. 6, 7. Dr. Pusey, 72—74.)

4. If to these we add what *Clement de Romana* has said, in the application of the term "*regeneration*" to the preaching "of righteousness," by Noah, to the *unbelieving* world in his days, we shall see reason to be assured (though the samples, in the midst of such paucity of holy writers, may not be large) that the *teaching* of "SPIRITUAL RE-

GENERATION *to persons who had been BAPTIZED*" or *circumcised*, was not confined to *Christ and his Apostles*; but was a thing *no way uncommon among the APOSTOLIC FATHERS!!*

Dr. Pusey also in the same place quotes *St. Chrysostom* and *St. Jerome*, as speaking of a "second regeneration," by "*repentance*," in persons who had backslidden from their first love.

Notwithstanding, however, what *Irenæus* says, as above, in reproof of those arrogant heretics who contravened the written word of the apostles by their pretence of tradition, and notwithstanding he gives *no* tradition from *St. Polycarp* respecting John iii. 5, "Water and the Spirit," Dr. Pusey contrives to make *Irenæus*, from "oral teaching," to limit, if not directly to contradict the apostle's *writings*. He quotes a long piece, sufficiently unintelligible about the "old fathers," who lived before Christ, obtaining "cure and remission" by his death; while for "those who now sin, Christ shall not now die;"—that is, shall not now die a *second time*, to save such as have *apostatized* from faith in his true suffering. And the same teacher concludes, "We ought not then, to be proud, nor to blame the ancients; but ourselves to fear, lest after we have acknowledged JESUS CHRIST, if we do anything displeasing to God, we may have not remission of sins, but be excluded from his kingdom." *This*, with a similar quotation from his great favourite *Hermas*, Dr. Pusey speaks of as "limiting very awfully what their (the apostles') written teaching has left undefined." (66, 67.) Let the reader take notice that *Irenæus* says he *heard* the above "from a *certain* presbyter, who *heard* it from *those*, who had seen the *apostles*, and *learnt* it from them!" Never let THIS be forgotten, while Dr. Pusey's writings remain unrepented of, that he hereby attempts the "LIMITING VERY AWFULLY" the obvious meaning of the "WRITTEN" instruction of the *apostles*, from his confidence in "ORAL" instruction derived through *FOUR reporters in succession!!!*

The unintelligible and contradictory jargon which Dr. Pusey quotes from *Hermas*, does not far exceed in mysticism and absurdity, his own mode of putting the case,—"*Limiting very awfully what the apostles' written teaching has left undefined.*" Is this intelligible? "*Undefined*," we suspect is not the idea we are intended to gather

from this oral teaching. Hermas first "rightly" hears, that there is "*no other* repentance," but at baptism: then he learns that it was "*not* repentance for sin, but remission," which was enjoyed at baptism. He is further informed, that there is "*one* repentance," after baptism!!

We confess we do not understand Dr. Pusey's instruction here. He says these "writers" refer "to the oral, as we to the written teaching of the apostles." And yet after making his quotations, the substance of which is given above, he calls them "*apostolic sayings*," and considers them the foundation upon which the church afterwards raised its practice of admitting penitents once only to reconciliation after baptism. (66, 7.) Thus, was introduced one claw of the cloven foot of *Popery*: namely, "LIMITING VERY AWFULLY" the gospel way of salvation, and closing in great measure, the door of mercy, which Christ and his apostles, in their "*WRITTEN teaching*," have set wide open to every repentant sinner. We may painfully ask, can Dr. Pusey find any rest to the sole of his foot, now, until he resorts to the infallible guidance and relief of PENANCE and *POPERY*? We conceive not.

Now we have got into the third century, and have found nothing favourable to *Dr. Pusey's* interpretation of "water and the Spirit," and have withal reached the regions of *tradition*, from which he begins somewhat boldly to limit, mutilate, or contradict the Scriptures. We may well be pardoned for paying less attention to *individual* writers: for henceforth we need not doubt but *man's* word will be referred to for authority, as Clemens Alexandrinus referred to the writings of *Hermas*, "whom he regards as having received inspiration only second to Scripture." (69). And with such sentiments once imbibed, respecting writings so manifestly absurd, we may soon expect to find that they will not scruple to "*make the word of God of none effect by their traditions*."

### TERTULLIAN, the first Latin Father.

We once thought of leaving this celebrated author as an impracticable character, in the hands of modern advocates for unscriptural inventions: but on reconsideration we think it better to make a stand at the very outset, and with one of the most rugged writers, both in phrase and

sentiment, of all antiquity; feeling assured that if *this author* can be made at all conformable to a scriptural rule, and one diametrically opposed to that of the Oxford advocates, our work will subsequently become more satisfactory.

Before Dr. Pusey and his associates can be allowed to quote *Tertullian* to correct the Bible or give a traditional interpretation to it, we must expect him and those who quote him, to exhibit *common sense*, and common *fairness*. Dr. Pusey quotes this father as follows, (44, 5) :

“There is nothing,” says Tertullian, “which so hardens the minds of men, as that the Divine works appear in act so simple, while the effect promised is so magnificent;—a man let down into the water, while a few words are uttered, arises again not much, or not at all cleaner, it appears incredible that he should thereby have obtained immortality. Miserable unbelief, which denies to God his properties, simplicity and power. The first waters were ordered to bring forth living creatures, lest it should seem strange that in baptism waters should give life.” (45.)

The “*effect PROMISED* [*i. e.* to baptism] *is so magnificent!*” Here the *delusion* begins. This we are to embrace as Scripture, or as the intention of Scripture, and Scripture baptism! *Hitherto*, we believe, we have not met with a sentence or sentiment, like the above. *Tertullian*, therefore, we must confess to be the genuine *father* who gave currency to the evil we, in this discussion, deplore. Not a word is added in, or about this extract, in order to explain, modify, or correct the impression which the language necessarily produces in the reader’s mind. That is,

1. There are no *graces, conditions*, accompaniments, or qualifications specified, as *attendant* on the persons baptized.

2. No *Scriptures* are referred to by which are “*promised*” the effects produced. Still,

3. Those effects promised, are “*magnificent.*” In baptism the “*waters*” have given “*life.*” Yea, the baptized “have obtained *immortality*,” by being “washed” therein! And we are charged with “*miserable unbelief*” if we do not concur in such sentiments. Now, for our parts, we not only disbelieve, but we abhor them with all our heart, as the womb out of which have sprung all the abominations of ancient *superstition* and modern *popery*. There is not

in *Scripture* the shadow of a "*promise*" to baptism thus simply administered, and without internal qualifications, thus received,—*not one* in all the word of God ! Yet this is the *deception* which, like a concealed viper, secretly poisons the whole discussion,—the baseless theory is involved in these isolated, mis-stated references and cases.

If, however, it should be said that Dr. Pusey, Bishop Bethell, Bishop Mant, and Archbishop Lawrence, &c. when they make such extracts as attach these "*magnificent effects*" to baptism, simply, as baptism, are aware that *something* else must necessarily be *understood, though* it be not expressed by the authors in the text where they are recorded, and whence they are taken ; and that it will be only honest towards *Tertullian* to suppose that he *means*, in this place, respecting *baptism*, what he has *expressly* recorded of it in *others* : viz. as he expresses it, "*That bath is the sealing up (obsignatio) of faith, which faith begins, and is recommended by the faith of repentance,*" (Pusey, 213) we would ask, are we then to understand that *such* is an explanation to which our opponents will abide ? And that, in short, *Tertullian*, and by consequence other Fathers, must be understood to *MEAN*, whether they so express it or not, that "*faith and repentance*" are qualifications *required*, and *supposed* to be possessed by every person whom *they* speak of as being regenerated and saved by baptism ? If this be consistently embraced, and consistently borne out in the discussion, we do not see for what purpose any controversy is carried on.

If "*faith and repentance*" (we mean, of course, scriptural faith and repentance, with which salvation is uniformly, there, attached, and not a "*repentance*" divided into "*three*" sections, Pusey, 64) ; if faith and repentance are to be supplied from one part of the Fathers, to complete what is lacking in another, respecting qualifications for baptism, and that baptism must be added to these "*previous qualifications*," in order to form the complex character of that "*regeneration*" by which we "*enter into the kingdom of God*," we certainly have no objection to make to the statement thus explained. We believe it to be exactly coincident with *Scripture* in general, and with our Saviour's discourse with *Nicodemus*, in particular. We believe, and firmly maintain, that the true



and genuine admission into Christ's Holy Catholic Church, has always included "repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ, and baptism into faith, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost."

This explanation or apology the *early* Christian Fathers do not require; and it is due to the subsequent *pious* ones, who have written so loosely upon this subject. But we are not aware that *any* author, before Tertullian, has fairly laid himself open to such mischievous interpretations as Dr. Pusey puts upon the Christian Fathers, *without exception*, for near fifteen centuries! And we admit that even modern writers, when hardly pressed with the consequences of their opinions, make something like the same explanations and admissions. But they only do it to escape from present danger, and make no use of it in their instruction generally; so that the uniform effect is, and is intended to be, that "*regeneration is conveyed by baptism, and by baptism exclusively.*"

If the above explanation be admitted on behalf of the Fathers, it would be a mere war of words to dispute whether "faith and repentance" *include*, or are essentially *the same* with, *spiritual* "*regeneration.*" Of course we contend that they are the same, and are always connected in Scripture with the blessing of salvation; and, therefore, to deny, or withhold the *term*, regeneration, from "*faith and repentance,*" would be only to withhold what is not *essential* to eternal glory. But we at the same time insist upon the *necessity* of baptism to enter into the Church of Christ, though it is not, in all cases, essential to salvation.

THE FOLLOWING POSITION we hold, not as consistent with, and taught by, the *Scripture* alone, but by the general *body* of the Fathers of the Christian Church: *i. e.* that "*faith and repentance*" were not only necessary to regeneration in baptism, but that when THOSE GRACES were adequately exhibited by any *other* evidence, (as martyrdom, for instance,) *independent* of baptism, they were considered as a sure way to eternal salvation, though baptism could not be obtained. From which will follow this necessary conclusion: *viz.* that it is "FAITH and REPENTANCE" which *essentially constitute* the regeneration of baptism; because where faith and repentance can be

legitimately ascertained, they constitute regeneration, viz. spiritual, *saving* regeneration, WITHOUT *baptism*.

If Dr. Pusey insist upon the apparent literal construction of Tertullian's language, he should have made his readers acquainted with all that author says on the subject of baptism, and then they might have judged better respecting its scriptural propriety. Why did he not tell us that *Tertullian* considered that an *angel* came down to give efficacy to the waters of baptism!—that the Spirit brooded on the waters as the most *approved*\* element!—that Christians are *fishes* which cannot live out of the water! If he has overstepped the *Scriptures* in these matters, how can we in others accept him as a sure guide? And as *he* is admitted to be the *most obscure* of writers, how can “all persons, everywhere, and at all times,” be supposed to understand “born of water and the Spirit,” in the *same* “*sense*” as he does? But this Dr. Pusey's system makes necessary. Yet this is rendered the more improbable, rather *impossible*, when we consider that in the only place (we believe) in which Dr. Pusey has quoted from Tertullian any direct exposition of “*water and the Spirit*, without which we cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven,” *he* interprets it thus; *i. e.* “*Shall not be HOLY.*” (279.)

This exposition, received *literally* and without modification, would directly *contradict* both *Scripture*, the other *Fathers*, and Dr. Pusey himself. For *he* views the Old Testament Fathers as eminently *holy*, and particularly insists upon the prayers and almsgiving of *Cornelius* as constituting “his previous holiness,” which he says was “the fruit of faith in God, and of the guidance of his Holy Spirit,” *before* he was baptized. (137.) Besides, all the *philosophers* who embraced Christianity, even as early as Justin Martyr, as well as Dr. Pusey, esteemed such heathens as Socrates and Plato “*holy men.*” How then are these things to be understood? It is quite impossible that every inquirer should comprehend them in the *same light*. And it is perfectly certain that *all* do not

\* How strange, then, must it seem that *man*, the lord of the creation, was not created out of this “most *approved* element;” while “birds,” including sparrows, probably might be so. “Yet are ye (men) not more valuable than many sparrows?” How very unwise the conceits of many of these learned fathers!

comprehend them as Dr. *Pusey* does, and insists upon it that they ought to be understood. Such writings are precisely of that character, that a captious and ingenious man may turn them to anything, and make of them what he pleases. *Thus, Dr. Pusey. Thus, the papists.* We shall here make a few remarks.

1. How can we fairly and honestly *reconcile* these apparent contradictions, respecting *regeneration* and *holiness*, for instance, for which Tertullian makes the “*water and the Spirit*” necessary? Why in those early times the TERMS “*Saints,*” “*Believers,*” “*Elect,*”\* “*Holy Brethren,*” &c. were ascribed and confined, technically, to those who had *entered into* “*Christ’s holy Church*” by belief and BAPTISM? And for the enjoyment of that holy society BOTH the SPIRIT’S sanctification and its *representative*, BAPTISM, were *required*. *Thus* the contradiction disappears. Faith was universally required, and a “*holy,*” a “*most holy faith,*” too, *before* baptism. But a person was numbered among the saints only by baptism; and as such, was reputed and called a *saint* or a *believer*, and not before.

2. Again. Tertullian, as above, says that the *simplicity* of the means, compared with the sublimity of the effect, greatly hardens “*the minds of men.*” But does not this sound grievously absurd, and is it not like charging God foolishly? To *whom* are these simple things foolishness? Not to the Christian. They are the joy of his heart; but to the pride and philosophy of *heathenism*, which, like modern *Romanism*, esteemed *things* great in proportion to the *pomp* and *display* attending them; and thus measuring the effect by the *apparent* magnificence of the cause. *This* was what led those philosophising Fathers to *conceal* the simplicity of the Christian sacraments; and, to conciliate their heathen neighbours, and indeed to imitate them, they called them “*mysteries.*”

3. Thus also, with due *candour*, we may judge of the “*VISIONS*” of even *Hermas*, and of the “*PISCINA,*” and “*FISHES*” of *Tertullian*, which “*could not live out of the waters.*” These “*WATERS*” *figuratively* represented “*the wells of salvation,*” those divine *truths* which are laid open

° See Bingham, sect. 1, &c.

in the Christian Church to all believers; they are *entered* by baptism, and *lived* upon by faith through life; they did indeed involve, under this mystic and childish form, the “doctrines which are according to godliness,” without which a Christian man would, like a “*fish*” taken from the *water*, *die*. This is no invention of ours; the *historians* of ancient usage give us this very explanation.

“And upon this account, (*viz.*) because the *Christian* LIFE took its *original* from the *waters of baptism*, and depended upon the *observance of the covenant* made therein, the Christians were wont to please themselves with the artificial name *Pisciculi*, fishes, to denote, as *Tertullian* words it, that they were regenerate, or born INTO CHRIST’S RELIGION *by water*, and could not be saved but by *continuing therein* ;” (Bing. Ants. c. 1 and 2.) that is, by “CONTINUING” in that RELIGION.

This is doubtless the common sense of the thing. And thus the mysticism and allegory of this obscure writer become intelligible and scriptural. And *thus* we find that our Lord’s words, “Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot *enter* into the kingdom of God,” or into the spiritual society of true believers in the Church of Christ, become a genuine *key* by which to understand not the *Scripture* only, but the sometimes not very intelligible language of the *Christian Fathers*.

The attentive reader will readily perceive that our *direct* object here is more particularly to *search out the truth*, than to overthrow the forced and unnatural constructions of Dr. Pusey; though probably the exhibition of truth may most effectually confront error as well.

4. Hence we may further explain what is meant by *keeping the seal of baptism*, which Dr. Pusey takes so much pains to darken; and instead of guiding the reader “into all truth,” by going first to the Scriptures to prove his point, and then coming down through the authorized and legitimate Fathers and their writings, to shew their coincidence with the same, he deludes and beguiles him by referring, not to the earliest Fathers and to their genuine productions, but to the most obscure writers, and to works *as theirs* which they never wrote. For this purpose he quotes even *Hermas*, and the apocryphal epistle ascribed to *Clement* of Rome, which the Professor, for the sake of gaining the good opinion of his

readers towards it, chooses to consider as the "probable" production of that first apostolic Father; and when he has done all, he has done nothing. That writer, as quoted by Dr. Pusey (70), says, "Of such as have not kept the seal (baptism), he saith, 'their worm dieth not.'" He obviously means that the man who has not "kept the *faith*" of the gospel which he professed to believe, and to which at baptism both God and the believer set to their "seal," must perish.

We beg the reader to remark here again how Dr. Pusey has *failed* to prove *his* sense of *John* iii. 5, by tracing it *from the Apostles to our Reformation*. We have not discovered a single veritable instance, not even including *Tertullian*, which makes out his meaning of it.

### *Infants.*

Much less has he succeeded in proving, for the two full centuries which have now passed over us, his assertion that "born of water and the Spirit" applies to *infants*, according to the fathers, "most effectually, directly, and universally;" when the *truth* is, we have never yet met with that text in application to the case of *infants* at all. There cannot be the least doubt but that *infants* were, from our Saviour's time, a part of his "kingdom," and that they, as well as adults, were introduced into it by baptism. But for a writer to put an unwarrantable "sense" upon a *text* of Scripture, and then boldly and roundly to declare that such has been always held to be its meaning in the Christian Church, from our Lord's days, and that his words, "water and the Spirit," apply "most effectually, directly, and universally," to *infants*, though *no author* has *so applied* his words *for some hundred years*, is really a liberty taken with the confidence of his reader which becomes no man living who is *not infallible!*

---

The reader, we presume, will think with us that it is unnecessary to pursue the interpretation of the Fathers, *individually*, any further. 1. Because the pursuit would

be interminable; and 2. Because we should only arrive at the same conclusion with *each* as we have arrived at with respect to Tertullian.\*

1. The reader knows that the "*conclusion*" above spoken of is, that when the Christian Fathers speak, as they often do in very extravagant language, of "*regeneration*," "*illumination*," and "*immortality*," as blessings *conferred by baptism*, they must always mean, even when they do not say so, that "*repentance* whereby they forsake sin and heathenism," and "*faith* whereby they believe the promises of God made to them in that sacrament," are *implied* and *possessed* by every person on whom they pronounce those blessings. And that,—

2. Wherever *repentance* and *faith* are known or believed to exist, *to such* the aforesaid blessings attach, though baptism could not be attained.

3. Thus, therefore, attaching salvation, regeneration, and every gospel blessing, where the *Scripture* and our Church place them, *i. e.* on the *internal change of heart to God*, whether found at baptism or elsewhere.

To most of *this* even Dr. *Pusey himself*, however destructive it may be to his labours, gives his reluctant assent, when he admits that "baptism without faith un-

\* We might very properly inquire here, why we should give this writer implicit confidence when he speaks as we have seen respecting the waters of baptism, while we are obliged to set aside his judgment respecting various *other* particulars? For instance, *second marriages*, which he, in mistake of *Scripture*, considered nearly as *adultery*;—his *tradition* respecting the unlawfulness, though he admitted that no *Scripture* forbade it, of a Christian soldier's wearing a crown of laurel. And, notwithstanding his singular *talents* and learning, his first joining the weak and illiterate *Montanus*, and when he had forsaken him, setting up a *sect* which was called after his "*own name*;"—a sect which the great Augustine afterwards tore up by the roots.

But why should we talk of *talents*? For *Justin Martyr*, *Tertullian*, and *Origen*, were men of the first-rate learning and abilities in their day, yet all of them, more or less, corrupted "the word of God" by their learning and "*philosophy*, falsely so called;" and thus gradually laid the foundation upon which subsequent writers, growing in corruption and decreasing in scriptural piety, built the Babel of "*Anti-christ*;" for the support of which, and to prevent or suspend its predicted, and we trust approaching downfall, Dr. *Pusey* and his brethren, we fear, are constructing a buttress, and wishing to base it (which God forbid!) on *Protestant ground*.

doubtedly will save none; and faith also without charity profiteth nothing.”\*

The above are not isolated cases. Dr. Pusey argues the matter considerably at large, in more places than one; and either does not perceive, or hopes his reader will not perceive, that it digs up by the roots all his cant about “regeneration” as “*conveyed by baptism*,” and by baptism “exclusively;” when it *turns* out that by *baptism* he does not literally mean BAPTISM; but as his *explanation* implies he means “*repentance* from dead works” AND “*faith*,” (issuing in baptism) “in the living God.” Is it to be tolerated that writers should thus systematically delude their readers by terms which do not convey the genuine and true meaning which they appear, and seem intended to bear?

In explanation also of 1 Pet. iii. 21, baptism, in figure, like Noah’s ark, “saveth us; not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God;” Dr. Pusey writes, “i. e. baptism, not an outward rite, but accompanied with faith, the baptized person answering with a good conscience to the inquiry made into his faith.” (44.) That is, we are to understand when he *professed* to “*believe* in Christ to the saving of the soul” *at his baptism*.

And in note K. p. 220, in further pursuit of the same idea, he writes :

“This reference to the rite of interrogating candidates at baptism, as to their faith and their purpose in coming to holy baptism, appears to have been recognized by the Fathers generally, as St. Peter’s meaning—as ‘questioning appears to imply some more formal interrogatory as

\* We may learn from the above admission that the Professor is obliged to leave it to be implied, that “*baptism without faith*” may be received. And he asserts that “*faith without charity profiteth nothing*.” It will then inevitably follow from the author’s own words, that every baptism received *without faith*,” yea, and a faith which “*worketh by love*,” is “*PROFITABLE*” for “*nothing*.”

Hence, also, forasmuch as *Simon Magus’s* faith, which Dr. Pusey says he possessed, was not attended by charity, his “*baptism*” grounded upon it profited him “*nothing* ;” as St. Peter told him.

In the same place, where the Professor claims *faith* for *Simon Magus*, he again declares, that “the unbelieving adult could of course derive no present benefit from baptism.” (171, 2.) And in p. 173 he speaks respecting such, that they “receive baptism to their hurt.”

to the faith of the individual, such as that implied in Philip's words, 'If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest,' (Acts viii. 37.) The words of Tertullian, (De Resur. Carnis, c. 48.) 'The soul is sanctified, not by washing, but by answering;' are not only a comment on St. Peter's words, but almost an authoritative one. The Syriac version, '*confessing* God with a pure conscience,' gives us the tradition of the Eastern church at an early period; at least, it leads us to a public profession of faith, such as that made at baptism.—So St. Augustine: 'Baptism does not consist so much in the washing of the body, as in *the faith of the heart*,' whence 'the inquiry into a good conscience,' must be, inquiry into faith;"—in proof of the efficacy of the 'word of faith'—i. e. the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, then professed and believed, and to be guarded and kept, 'by God's help,' through life." (221.)

And after more to the same purpose, he adds,

"Other renderings of *επερωτημα*, are very unsatisfactory, except so far as they come round to this." (Ib.)

Theodoret, Dr. Pusey quotes as teaching that in "Baptism" "remission is given through faith alone." (65.)

We need not, though we might, quote more in proof of our position, namely, that the Fathers, (and Dr. Pusey, too, when he seems to forget himself,) when they speak of *baptism* as giving such magnificent blessings to the baptized, *include* in *that term* all those graces of the Spirit which are *represented* by baptism, and which are *professed* by all who are baptized.

We have also seen that, in the first two centuries, the terms \* "regeneration," &c., were employed to designate

\* "The terms of regeneration, &c. used in the first two centuries." By this we mean that they were then used in a more scriptural and spiritual sense; rather than were *confined* to the first ages alone, in a sense different from that generally used afterward. Even Dr. Pusey himself acknowledges that "Jerome and others" use the term "regeneration" either as meaning nothing but "being baptised," or else as being *DECLARATIVE* of the thing *professed* at baptism. Thus they used regeneration as applied to our *Saviour's* baptism. And some applied Ps. ii. 7 to the same event; "Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee:" which the Professor says, "can only mean, was 'declared to be the Son of God.'" (Note p. 17.)

We may observe here that no person, not wishing to be deluded, would take "*regeneration*" in a literal sense at the hands of such unguarded writers, when they confine it to baptism. *Making* persons Sons of God by baptism, *may*, we see, only mean, "*DECLARED*" to be the sons of God.



a *spiritual* and *holy change of heart*, not necessarily connected with baptism.

And further, that at all times, (unless when Popery stifled all truth,) repentance and faith were esteemed sufficient to entail regeneration and salvation without baptism, provided other evidence was given to prove them real.

Dr. Pusey admits that the "*Papal* argument for the *absolute* necessity of baptism" will not stand, (17,) and yet uses the same argument himself, (p. 13.)

### *Inference.*

We must very carefully and retentively notice here what is included in that *change of mind* to which blessings of salvation are annexed, and which are required and supposed, by the Scriptures, by the Fathers, and even by the admissions of Dr. Pusey himself. They are faith and repentance—and *these testified* at baptism,

1. "With a good conscience;" as Peter, Philip, and Pusey—"If thou believe *with all* thine heart; and this,

2. A "faith" also accompanied by "*charity*," Dr. P.; or "*confessing* God with a pure conscience," (Syr. Ver. ;) or,

3. *The faith of the heart*"—(August.)—"in the Blessed Trinity, to be *guarded and kept through life*."

We remark here two things :

1. That these principles or graces are both *holy* and *active*—*living* graces ; and,

2. That *without* them, baptism "*profiteth nothing*;" as Dr. Pusey asserts.

The reader must hold with a most determined hand the *truth* now established, i. e. that the "*faith*" which justifies, saves, and, if you will, regenerates man, is not "*dormant*," or "*passive*," but living and *active*—a faith which "*works by love*." We are very serious and earnest upon this score ; because it is at *this* joint that a delusion is introduced. We say *delusion* ; for notwithstanding the above, and other acknowledgments to the same effect, sprinkled over Dr. Pusey's book, they soon become nearly lost and invisible in the *mysticism* which the learned Professor contrives to envelope all those illuminating sayings. They are, in this author's pages, little more than blazing and momentary luminaries, which, having suddenly disappeared, render the general darkness the more bewildering.

This is no declamation—no calumny. For Dr. Pusey, even before he has finished the very note, (Note H, 222,) takes occasion, in explanation of *his* sentiments, as *opposed* to the reformers, to say, “Rather, baptism saves us, as the means appointed by God for remitting sin, and imparting new life.” Yes, “*baptism* (he explains it) *saves us*: baptism, without the former admitted “*repentance*,” “*faith*,” embracing “*love*,” and “*confession*, with a *pure conscience*,” “saves us,” by “*remitting* sin, and *imparting* new life.” And this is the common practice throughout his book. Witness pages 82, 83, 84, &c.; where he insists that it has been the notion of the whole Christian church, that the “sacraments do convey that also which they signify;” and “that the benefits of holy baptism are by virtue of the sacrament itself.” In other, or rather in many, places, he writes, that the “old Catholic doctrine” was, that “Christ conveyed his grace through his sacraments.” (91, 92, 93.)

#### INFANTS.

We admit that some of the Professor's observations apply particularly to *infants*. With respect to the advantage which he hopes to gain from the attempt to separate the case of *infants* from that of *adults*, and to ground, as *usual*, his arguments upon the loose sayings of the fathers; we have three things to say.

1. We have already, in our *Fifth* Number, unravelled his sophistry on that head.

2. In our *next* Number it is intended to disperse entirely the bewilderment, and serpentine character, still lurking under the notion of *latent* regeneration.

3. But there is another delusion imposed upon us here; *i. e.* that the regeneration of INFANTS by baptism, as held by the *Fathers* is exceedingly ambiguous and un-uniform; or, if uniform, not very intelligible; and where intelligible, *is not* the regeneration “imparting new *life*,” required by and spoken of in Scripture, *consisting in an implanted, holy renewal of the soul to God*.

#### TESTIMONIES RESPECTING THE FATHERS.

We have collected perhaps more than a hundred pages of extracts on this and its kindred subjects, which we in-

tended to have made large use of, in opposition to the gloss of Dr. Pusey and his brethren. But under the consideration that many of such testimonies would be only an *opinion* of some persons respecting the *opinion* of others, and neither of them *apostolic* or FINAL, we have decided to give only a mere sample; and that either from Dr. Pusey's own pages, or from two or three other veritable and important sources.

The *use* and *design* of these references the reader will understand, are mainly these; namely, not to *confide* in them as *Scripture*, or even as giving an indisputable and authorized, or general statement of the sentiments of the *Fathers*, on the subject of baptismal regeneration; but to break the arm, and neutralize the character, of Dr. Pusey's unwarrantable and untrue assumption, that the *Christian Fathers are to be received as authorized and intelligible interpreters of Scripture on this point*, and that *their sense and meaning of the Scriptures is that "one sense" which the Professor ascribes to them, and which he has adopted from them; which is a gross absurdity.* For it is perfectly clear, that unless the instruction of the Fathers be so plain, uniform, and obvious, as to compel the assent of every sensible and unprejudiced mind, their instruction, instead of enlightening will only bewilder; and leave every reader to make his own system out of them.

DR. BURGESS.—The Professor has himself introduced this author as bringing forward three extracts from the Fathers, in evidence that *they* did not consider all persons to be regenerate by baptism.

From *Chrysostom* he quotes: "Some who are ready to breathe their last, run unto baptism, and yet are never a whit the more purged by it."

From *Jerome*. He speaks of adults "Who appear to receive baptism, but he doubts whether they have the clothing of Christ: and with these he joins Simon Magus, who received the washing of water, but because he had not the Holy Spirit, had not put on Christ. 'There are many washings,—(Ezek. xvi. 4,)—but not unto salvation.'"

*Augustine* teaches; "Sacraments work what they shadow forth in the elect only."—2742.

Of these, Dr. Pusey, says, he cannot find the *last*. The *second* he admits; and the *first*, he tells us, is "*mis-translated*"!

AUGUSTINE, *quoted by Dr. Pusey*, and commented upon by him.—It seems somewhat extraordinary that our author, while he directly attacks every person who would limit the universal regeneration of mankind in baptism, under the instruction of the Fathers—does, nevertheless, himself adduce, from the Fathers, whole “classes” of persons who are baptized, and who yet “miss of the grace of baptism;” but he tells us from Augustine, that there are but “two classes.” “Often then, as St. Augustine speaks of those who miss of baptismal grace, they are always these two classes, those that are wanting in faith or love, hypocrites or heretics.” He might have added “schismatics” also. (276.)

He argues, a little lower in the same page, thus: “If then, innumerable often as he specifies these classes, he names no others, one should infer, on this ground alone, that St. Augustine held, that all baptized persons, of whatever age, received the benefits of baptism, those excepted who placed a bar of unbelief in heart or life against it. Even these St. Augustine maintained to have received real baptism, [qry., *regeneration?*] (since it could not be repeated,) and that its benefits, lay as it were, in them, then to be realized, whenever they should, in heart and mind, turn to God.”—(Ibid.)

Dr. Pusey argues as above for the sake of rescuing St. Augustine’s *exceptions* from being applied to *infants*, who, he says, cannot place “a bar of unbelief against it.” But the Professor’s opinion on this point, if correct, will go further than he intends it, and will make the “benefits of baptism” to “lay,” not in infants only,\* but in “them” who have in “heart or life,” “placed a bar of unbelief against” their admission.

If this be the truth, and if Dr. Pusey and St. Augustine be correct, it certainly is very extraordinary. For even a “bar of unbelief in heart or life” cannot, according to the above instruction, prevent the benefits of baptism, (that is, pardon of sin, and regeneration) from making their entrance, and *remaining*, too, in every person who is baptized!!!

\* “Infants only.”—“This grace of baptism—remained in them—as their powers of thought or reasoning do.”—150.

“A seminal regeneration (or *initial*, or *potential*), or again, an habitual (as opposed to active) principle of grace.”—151.

The Professor gives a very large extract from St. Augustine, of a very extraordinary character. The following is the substance of it.

“God does not give that perseverance to some of his sons.—For there are some, who by us, are called sons of God, on account of their having admitted grace, if but for a time; but they are not so in God’s sight; of whom John says, ‘they went out from us, for they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would have remained with us.’ They were not of the number of sons, even when they were in the faith of sons.” (277.) *True faith*, he means.

Dr. Pusey’s remark here, that Augustine’s “Predestination did not involve the doctrine of the indefectibility of grace,” is like most of his other remarks, calculated to mislead. Augustine’s “Predestination” *did* involve the doctrine of the “indefectibility of grace” in the *elect*. And Calvin himself never held perseverance in the non-elect. St. Augustine held an opinion very peculiar, namely, the opinion, That God gave the grace of holiness and regeneration to some, to whom he does “*not give that perseverance which leads to salvation.*” To such he says, we give the name of sons, but God does not; but only to them who “were of those predestinated and called according to his purpose, who are truly the sons of the promise.” (277.)

This extraordinary and unscriptural notion of Augustine discovers a very imperfect and inconsistent view of divine truth; and it arose from his unwarrantable ascription of *regeneration* to all that are baptized.

1. He considers, contrary to the Scriptures, in the above case, that *regeneration*, *i. e.* (“admitted grace”), does not make persons to be the true sons of God, but that “predestination” makes them so, in connexion with regeneration. That doubtless is the cause, but the *new and divine nature* is what truly constitutes “*sons of God.*”

2. He is unscriptural again, in admitting that God gives holiness to some, so that they have the same nature as “his true sons,” from whom he still withholds grace to persevere therein. But he has given no reason why the Allwise gives grace to *sinner*s to make them holy, and yet withholds grace from them when they are holy.

These anomalous circumstances, must, however, convince us, that respecting even the most renowned of the

Fathers, we need a great deal of liberality and wisdom so to interpret them as to make them at all *consistent* either with the *Scripture* or with *themselves*.

Dr. Pusey in the same place quotes from *Prosper* of Aquitaine, a sentiment still more absurd. He says of all baptized, their sins are remitted, and that some fall; "yet (he says of him who falleth) he doth not fall back into that which was remitted, nor will he be condemned in original sin; but for his last sins, he will receive that death, which was due to him for those which were forgiven him." Alas! for such authors! they have need that one "teach them again what be the first principles of the oracles of God!!" Dr. Pusey adds,

Augustine writes "And yet the grace of baptism is not alike to all, for heretics have the same baptism, and false brethren in the communion of the Catholic name." (276,) and again,—

"Augustine, most excellently do the Punic Christians entitle baptism itself no other than salvation. And the sacrament of the body of Christ no other than life. Whence, except from an old and, as I deem, apostolical tradition by which they hold it inserted in the church of Christ, that without baptism and the participation of the Lord's table, no man can arrive either at the kingdom of God, or salvation and life eternal. This, as we have said, is what the Scripture testifies, *i. e.* saves us as by washing, &c." Tit. iii. 5; 1 Pet. iii. 21.

No man, we presume, not wedded to the worst corruptions of popery, would ever understand in a *literal* sense, what *Augustine* informs us was excellently said by the African Christians: *i. e.* "that *baptism itself is salvation*," and the Lord's supper, "*life*." For in such case, every person *baptized*, or partaking of the holy *communion* would have *life and salvation*;" which the foregoing extracts about *apostacy*, from the *same* author, positively contradict. "*Baptism*," &c., here must mean repentance, faith and holiness, into which persons by baptism profess to enter, and at the Lord's Supper, renew their covenant. *Then* the whole becomes scriptural, intelligible, and consistent; otherwise it is perfectly heretical; for many are saved without either baptism or the Lord's Supper, &c. Augustine owns this; and many, as he also allows, "miss of salvation," who enjoy them both.

The same candour of interpretation must be allowed to the short extract before this, where Augustine says, “the *grace* of baptism is not alike to *all*.” But why? If baptism conveys the grace of regeneration; *i. e.* “pardon of *sin*, and a *new life*,” it must be alike to all; for none can have more. Here, again, therefore, it is perfectly certain that the *mind* makes the difference.

*Respecting Infants.*

BINGHAM.—We have transcribed numerous cases from this author. We give a sample.

Augustine’s answer to Boniface’s query, “how could it be said with truth that a child believed, renounced the devil, or turned to God, who had no thought or apprehension of these things; or if any, yet secret and unknown to us;” is very remarkable, and demonstrates beyond the possibility of fair contradiction that the *Fathers* did not take a clear, consistent, or wise measure of baptism and regeneration. Augustine answers by saying,—

“That the child is only said to believe, because he receives the sacraments of faith and conversion, which entitles to the name of believer. For the sacraments, because of the resemblance between them and the things represented by them, do carry the name of the things represented. Christ was but once offered in himself, and yet he is offered, not only at the annual solemnity of the *passover*, but every day by the people: and no one tells a lie who says he is offered.” Yet surely, if men speak without explanation what necessarily leads an honest attentive hearer to “believe a lie,” they must be said in fact, that is, in truth, to “*tell a lie*.”

What is meant here by “the *sacrament* of Christ’s body,” which the “people *offer every day*.” Surely this is explaining one mystery by another mystery; and thus turning all things into mysticism and confusion: what do the people offer? When he says, “after a *certain manner*,” it is his body we suppose he must mean that it *figures* forth or *represents*, his body.—True; but out of unguarded language like this the worst corruptions of popery, in after ages, had their origin. These pompous words to *men’s* performances, have always a pernicious tendency. They produce, and were intended to produce, ideas which language stating only the simple truth will not convey.

“As therefore, the sacrament of Christ’s body, after a certain manner, is called his body; and the sacrament of his blood, is called his blood; so the sacrament of faith is (called) faith. And upon this account, when it is answered, that an infant believes, who has not yet any knowledge or habit of faith, the meaning of the answer is, that he hath faith because of the sacrament of faith, and is converted to God because of the sacrament of conversion. For these answers appertain to the sacrament.”

*Bingham* observes on this; “so that according to St. Augustine, when an infant is said to have faith, the meaning is only, that he receives the sacrament of faith, which faith he is bound to embrace when he comes to understand it.” (*Bing. Ant. i. p. 511.*)

*Bingham* having quoted the opinion of *Hincmar* respecting the salvation of many *infants* who died *unbaptized*, through the perverseness of some bishop who had denied them baptism; adds,

1. “It cannot be denied but that infants may be martyrs as well as adults, as those were whom Herod slew.

2. “Parents may likewise desire baptism for their children, vowing faith and repentance in their name, where some extreme necessity and not any culpable neglect hinders the obtaining of it.”

“If we thus interpret the sense of the ancients with *Hincmar*, then all those passages which condemn infants dying without baptism, must be understood not of the bare want of baptism, when it could not be had, but of the parents’ contempt or neglect when it was in their power.” (437.)

Professor Pusey recites with approbation the following expressions of Augustine :

“He is healed by the words of another, since he was wounded by the sin of another: it is asked ‘does he believe in Jesus Christ?’ it is answered, ‘he does believe.’ The answer is made for him who speaks not: but is silent and weeps, and by weeping begs, in a manner, for help.”

1. We here remark that the “*sacrament*” of regeneration was often spoken of as synonymous with regeneration *itself*. A “new life” was then and there professed, either personally or by substitute, and the *profession* in those early days was not so frequently, as now, belied



by future conduct. We argue, therefore, that *Those who were in the habit of saying that the SACRAMENT of faith and conversion, is faith and conversion, could with equal readiness, and with equal sincerity say, the SACRAMENT of regeneration, IS REGENERATION.*

2. *We see here that INFANTS when baptized, were not only called REGENERATE, but were styled "BELIEVERS, CONVERTED," as well as regenerate; simply because they had received the sacrament of baptism which REPRESENTED ALL THESE THINGS.*

The ground of all this is manifest. *Baptism* was a representation of man's profession, and is in conjunction with the "Spirit," the door, as Hooker calls it, of admission into the true church of Christ. The *profession* was all that man could judge by, respecting the Spirit which actuated the candidates; the PROFESSION was, and is, and ever must be, *at the time, admitted as the reality, and be called by its name.*

For, as Hooker says, (from Augustine) "without fear or scruple we may account and term them believers only for their outward professions' sake which inwardly are further from faith than infants; the whole church is a multitude of believers, all honoured with that title, even hypocrites, for their professions' sake, as well as saints." (64.)

*If we do not allow that many persons are CALLED christians merely because they PROFESS to be so, who are NOT christians INDEED, we shall deny what all the world acknowledges and knows to be true; and if we do allow it, and carry our allowance properly into our INTERPRETATION OF THE FATHERS, the knot is untied; and no real difficulty whatever remains.*

When Augustine above speaks of the "*whole church as believers,*" and yet as containing "*hypocrites,*" we perceive how he mingles the *true church* with the *professing church*: which last is *not* the church, but only *professes* to be so. "*Hypocrites for their professions' sake,*" are *called* believers, though they are not believers. This explains the whole matter. Men, in being introduced into the church of Christ, are *accepted by their "profession,"* which is known, and not by their internal character, which may not be known. "*Hypocrites*" make "*profession,*" and obtain the credit and acknowledgment

of belonging to the *profession*, not belonging to the *hypocrite*.

*Such* do not “enter” into Christ’s church, though they profess to do so; *only those* who have both “*water and the Spirit*,” which hypocrites have not.

FORBES observes, respecting the fathers, “Austin, and many others, believed respecting reprobate children, when they grew up and lacked the spirit of forgiveness of (towards?) their brethren, &c.” (C. 16. p. 529.)

—“Most considered their sins only conditionally forgiven in baptism.” (Ib.)

—“And that though they were regenerate and ingrafted into Christ, as to the reception of baptism, they had not received the incorruptible seed, were not of the number of Christ’s saints; in short, were not born of God.” (531.) Forbes proceeds:

“To an objection about the means, St. Austin says; ‘I answer, the sacraments never were, nor are they either the sole, or the principal means of man’s salvation: the chief means for the salvation of little children are the passion of Christ, the faith of the parents, or of the church; the prayers of the pious, the sanctification of the child by the internal grace of the Holy Spirit: these are means of perpetual efficacy, whether the visible sign be afforded, or not afforded.’”\*

FABER (on the ordinary operations of the Spirit) says; “Our venerable Reformers, in exact accordance with Tillotson, Hopkins, and Wilkins, clearly speak of regeneration as taking place in adult subjects *after* baptism; therefore they do not *necessarily*, and *in the way of cause and effect*, attach the inward grace to the outward sign. *The same doctrine was taught and maintained by the primitive church from the beginning.*

“The early ecclesiastical writers do, indeed, perpetually bestow upon the outward sign, the appellation of inward grace: for baptism they are wont familiarly to denominate

\* *Respondia, sacramenta nunquam fuerunt, neque sunt, vel sola, vel præcipua salutis humanæ media: præcipua media pro parvulorum salute sunt passio Christi; parentum fides, vel ecclesiæ, preces piorum sanctificatio ipsius parvuli, per internam gratiam Spiritus Sancti; hæc sunt media perpetuæ efficacitatis, sive accedat visibile signum, sive non accedat.*” (Forbes, c. 16. p. 508.)

This one sentence annihilates Dr. Pusey’s notion about the Fathers and baptismal regeneration.

*illumination* or *regeneration*; while correspondingly, the baptized they style the *illuminated* or *regenerated*. But whenever they descend to the strictness of definition and explanation, they *then* teach us distinctly that the inward grace does *not necessarily* attend upon the outward sign; that a man may be *externally baptized* without being *internally regenerated*: and that spiritual regeneration is by *no means* inseparably attached even to the *most canonical* administration of baptism. Such, not to mention others, is the doctrine explicitly taught by the great Augustine, by Jerome, and by Cyril of Jerusalem: and the declaration of the last of these three writers, I cannot but deem peculiarly important; because, speaking to the collective body of the catechumens, in his official capacity of the episcopally appointed public catechist of the church of Jerusalem, he must plainly be viewed as propounding, not merely his own isolated private sentiments, but the universally received doctrine of the primitive church catholic."

"In the case of *infants*, Augustine taught that regeneration always accompanied baptism: but then, in *their* case he understood regeneration to mean nothing more than a *federal change of condition*. Hence he contended that a *moral* change of disposition, which he styles conversion, and which was *not* communicated at baptism, must, in order to salvation, follow afterward."\* (De Corrup. et Grat. de Baptismo.)

"According to the voice of antiquity, and by the *explanatory* statement in the first part of the Homily for Whit-Sunday, we must obviously understand the phraseology of our Anglican church in her baptismal offices. *In the judgment of charity*, it is *hoped* and *presumed* that the inward grace attends upon the outward sign: but when our Reformers, like the early ecclesiastics, descend to the strictness of explanation, they *then* teach us that a *baptized* individual *may*, nevertheless, still need to be *spiritually regenerated*,—whether in baptism or the eucharist, the outward visible sign may be given *without* any communication of the inward spiritual grace, which was

\* "*Conversion not communicated by baptism.*" Notwithstanding this doctrine of Augustine, Pusey quotes him as teaching that *both* regeneration and conversion take place at baptism.

the doctrine of the primitive catholic church, and it is still the doctrine of the reformed Church of England."

HOOKE. — We shall close our references with an extract or two from the venerable Hooker.

"The greatest moral perfection of baptism consisteth in men's devout obedience to the law of God, which law requireth both the outward act, or thing done; and also, that religious affection which God doth so much regard, that without it, whatsoever we do, is hateful in his sight. The first thing required of him who standeth for admission into Christ's family, is *belief*. So the true reason wherefore Christ doth love true believers is, because their belief is the *gift of God*; a gift, than which, flesh and blood in this world cannot possibly receive a greater. — No religion enjoyeth sacraments, — the signs of God's love — unless it have also *that faith whereon the sacraments are built*, and which is to the kingdom of God a key, the want whereof excludeth infidels both *from that kingdom*, and all other saving grace."\*

"*Two covenants* there are which Christian men do make in *baptism* — the one concerning the *relinquishment* of Satan, the other touching the obedience to the '*faith of Christ*.' Neither do I think it a matter easy for men to prove, that ever baptism did use to be administered without interrogatories of these two kinds." Id. b. v. § 63.

Hooker gives us what we may safely receive as the summing up of the whole survey of all different or discordant opinions on the subject of baptism, its necessity, and its importance.

"It is on all parts gladly confessed, *there may be* in divers cases, life by virtue of *inward baptism*, even when *outward* is not found. So that if any question be made, it is but about the bounds and limits of this possibility. It has been therefore *constantly held*, as well touching *other believers* as martyrs, that baptism taken away by necessity, is supplied by desire of baptism, because *with equity* this opinion doth best stand. Such infants, which die unbaptized, the judgment of many hath gone hard against them. But seeing grace is *not absolutely tied to the sacraments*, God imputeth the secret desire that others have on their behalf, and accepteth the same as theirs." § 60.

\* Ecclesiastical Polity, c. ii. § 5.

We may observe, respecting *Hooker's* notion of *imputation*, here stated, that we do not know of any imputation of the holiness of one person to the use of another, saving the righteousness of Jesus Christ imputed for the justification of sinners; yet, ecclesiastically speaking, we do not know how far the holiness of a parent may be beneficial to the child, and how far God may accept the real desires of the parent, in external matters, as a substitute for the infant's lack of performance. "I will have mercy and not sacrifice," is a blessing of universal, when of just and necessary, application. If *Moses* had not *neglected* his child's circumcision, God would not have been angry; witness its long *omission* in the wilderness where no such displeasure was shewn.

---

The foregoing testimonies, which might be multiplied to almost any extent, will we conceive be deemed perfectly satisfactory for the purpose for which we principally use them, *i.e.* to show the utter *inutility* and perfect *impracticableness* of Dr. Pusey's system, which is to send us to the *fathers* for *his* interpretation of "*water and the Spirit*;" who, he assures, have *handed down* to us, that "one sense which he has embraced, even from the *apostles' days*." We assert that such a system is, for all practical and useful purposes, visionary and mischievous: which the statements above made from Burges, Bingham, Faber, Hooker, and himself, abundantly prove.

1. We have seen that, as *THEY understand* the ancients, those *fathers* do *NOT mean* what Dr. Pusey's system asserts that they *do mean*. So that there is a "division among" the readers and *interpreters* of the fathers themselves. But we have seen that *Bingham, Faber, &c.*, have given *evidence* from the fathers themselves, that they *must* be so understood, and that they do *so explain* their *own* meaning, as those authors explain them. Yea, and even Dr. Pusey *himself*, is occasionally compelled to make the same admissions; though he takes great pains to get those admissions out of sight again, as soon as possible.

We assert that this process, at least *NEUTRALIZES and makes void* all Dr. Pusey's quotations and inferences from the *fathers*, because those writers, it is proved, do not mean what isolated passages, so extracted from them, *seem* to

mean. If it be objected that the afore-mentioned writers have no more right to claim *their* interpretation for the *fathers* than Dr. Pusey and his associates have *theirs*: we would answer, that so far as they substantiate their claim from the fathers themselves (in which Dr. Pusey himself at times concurs), they *have* a perfect and *exclusive* right—a right which Dr. Pusey can never disprove. But on *any* ground the *professor* cannot claim a right of interpretation which *they* have not.

Then, if *their* authority be only equal to Dr. Pusey's, on interpretation, seeing it is so directly in *opposition* to his, it is obvious that it neutralizes and *makes* his interpretation void. As two bodies of equal gravity and velocity striking a third in opposite directions, destroy each other's influence, while the body itself remains unaffected by the collision.

2. But when to this we *add* that the entire evidence of the APOSTOLIC FATHERS is against Dr. Pusey's exclusive interpretation, that their *silence* respecting "*water conveying the Spirit*," and their use of *repentance, faith, holiness, and conversion*, promiscuously, as identical with "*spiritual regeneration*," we shall see sufficient reason to assert that the *professor's chain is broken off from the apostles in its very first links*. If we *further* consider that Irenæus, the first authorized link in the chain of *tradition*, has not given from the mouth or writings of Polycarp, the *last* apostolic father, a single sentiment confirmatory of Dr. Pusey's system, and moreover, that *Tertullian* may be conformably understood: we may assure ourselves, without fear of contradiction, that so far as *the fathers* are concerned, Dr. Pusey has "*built his house upon the sand*." For, what *Hooker* writes (B. v. § 67.) that "*variety of judgments and opinions argueth obscurity in those things whereabout they differ*;" was never more *pungently* applicable than to the "*obscurity*" out of which Dr. Pusey vainly attempts to elicit divine light from the human authority of the Christian fathers.

### *The Church of England.*

As we shall probably take another opportunity of saying something upon the subject of the *services* of the church, we shall here only make a few observations, and such as are connected with the interpretation of the fathers. That the Established Church has servilely copied the fathers in her

views and administration of the sacraments, must be denied: let those services be derived from what source they might, we do not perceive that they are an exact copy from any.

1. We admit that the baptismal service seems constructed *greatly* after the ancient manner of the fathers, though not agreeing, we believe, in doctrine with any one of them. But had the church viewed the opinions and authority of the fathers, in the slavish manner which Dr. Pusey does, she would in *other* matters have followed them as well as in those which she has adopted.

2. She has *purged* our services from numbers of things which they adhered to, and of some which they considered *apostolic*; which she never would have done, had she not viewed them as being unscriptural whencesoever derived.

Archbishop *Laurence* says our offices are *Lutheran*. If so, why did our Church cast out *consubstantiation*, which Luther never resigned. She has also laid aside numerous extravagant *notions* as well as *usages* of the ancients. We call them extravagant, for what less than extravagant are the sayings of *Austin, Prosper, Jerome, Fulgentius, Chrysostom, Cyril*, which follow?

“*The baptismal water is red when once it is consecrated.*” “*In baptism we are dipped in blood.*” “*Be ye baptized in blood in the laver of regeneration.*” “*The flesh of Christ is eaten and his blood drank in the laver of regeneration.*” “*They that are baptized put on a royal garment, a purple dipped in the blood of the Lamb.*” The baptized “*immediately embraces Christ in his arms, that he is united to his body, nay, compounded or consubstantiated with that body which sits above.*” “*As the bread in the eucharist, after the invocation of the Holy Spirit, is not mere bread, but the body of Christ, so this holy ointment, after invocation, is not bare common ointment, but it is a gift of God that makes Christ and the Holy Spirit to be present in the action,*” &c. &c. (Bing. 519. 520.)

St. Austin calls “*exorcism*” a sacrament, and also the *salt* that was given to the Catechumens before baptism. This our church has laid aside as an invention of man and not an appointment of God. We differ from the primitive church in excluding *Chrism*; in separating confirmation from baptism: in not giving the eucharist to *infants*; in omitting *exorcism*; and forbidding *lay* baptism; and especially in having *no mysteries*, or mys-

terious things which we studiously keep from all but the "initiated."

These things, independent of the *repetition* of unction, crossings, and a host of ceremonies which got to be common in the church in the third and fourth centuries, are laid aside. Dr. Pusey sorely regrets the loss of several of these, especially *exorcism*, and wishes they could be *restored*. A sure sign the CHURCH and the *Professor*, are not one.

Respecting the mysteries, *Ambrose* says, his own "common discourses to the unbaptized, were only upon points of morality; but when they were baptized, then was the time to open to them the mysteries of the sacraments of religion. To have discoursed to them of those things before, had been more like exposing mysteries than explaining them." (Bing. Oxf. Edit. v. i. p. 26.)

We cannot but consider the habit of withholding from persons under divine instruction, any part of God's holy word on those points which lie at the very commencement of the Christian life, as most highly censurable and unscriptural. The *Apostles* never did this. Nay, they consider the "doctrine of baptism and laying on of hands," as matters so obvious and elementary, that all must needs be acquainted with them.

This concealment of mysteries, before they were embraced and received, is even wicked. To cause a person to undergo a ceremony, the nature of which he was to learn only *after* he had received it, is such a sort of Freemasonry as is highly offensive to Scripture. And it seems, as before remarked, to have been adopted only for the sake of avoiding giving offence to the Heathen, or to excite (as *Augustine* says) the "curiosity" of the enquirer. But surely nothing could be a greater disappointment to a person invited by "magnificent" words, than to find all these mystical words terminating in so very simple a ceremony as "washing in water," an *act*, though not as an *appointment*, which all the world was acquainted with! And the not allowing the *unbaptized* to use even the "Lord's Prayer," or to call God their "Father, or the church their mother," seems like lighting a candle by giving *instruction*, and putting an extinguisher upon it as soon as lighted, lest it should be seen that light and heat had been communicated before *bap-*



*tism* was administered. This vicious custom had not begun to work in *Justin Martyr's* days. In what *language*, to *whom*, and in whose *name*, could these Catechumens be *taught to pray*?

Such awful perversion of Scripture, joined with that other extraordinary oversight, the giving the eucharist to *infants*, (not to say, which nevertheless some did, to dying or dead men) must for ever root up all implicit confidence in *those Fathers* as veritable interpreters of *Scripture*. Who can believe that the *Apostles*, *confirmed* and gave the *eucharist* to *infants*; yet the *Christian Fathers* did *both* these, till the sixth or seventh century.

Soon after, or in some parts, possibly before, the death of the Apostolic Fathers, the *language* of the church began to be very loose, indistinct, and even erroneous, respecting both the *number*, the *design*, and *efficacy* of the sacraments. And the further they advanced the further their language, generally speaking, diverged from the simplicity of Divine truth. And though Augustine restored a more Scriptural mode of teaching religious truth, he never seems to have possessed clear, consistent, and apostolical views of the holy sacraments.

We do not find any of the *Fathers*, though they do occasionally speak of *tradition*, acting like *Dr. Pusey*, and directing us to *human* testimony for the purpose of correcting the *Divine*. But this subject we would rather leave to younger writers, with better memories. But our CHURCH does (and indeed the pious Fathers all do) so explicitly, and of set purpose, refer us to the *Scriptures* for every "*article of faith*," that, could there be found any portion of *her ritual* which *apparently* teaches us a "*doctrine not found in Scripture nor which may be proved thereby*," we have her own warning, yea rather her command, not to put *such a sense* upon it, because *that* would be contrary to her first principles and her great design.

What then can we say of persons who, like the Oxford advocates, seize upon a few words in a prayer or ordinance, put their own isolated construction upon it, and thus force it to speak a language contrary to *her doctrinal, matured, and deeply studied* "ARTICLES OF RELIGION;" as well as to *the word of God itself*? When, therefore, we find writers like *Dr. Pusey*, and his Oxford associates,

gravely arguing that a *devotional office*, in which all are to join, is a more genuine and appropriate index of the *doctrines* of our church, than those "*Articles of Religion*," which she expressly composed to *explain* them, we are so exceedingly puzzled that we know not how to account for it, unless we ascribe it to moral obliquity or mental imbecility.

We do not mean here to enter upon an explanation which is intended for a future number; but we may perhaps be pardoned for so far anticipating the design, as by observing that if we only apply to our *baptismal offices*, the same analogical reasoning for its consistency which Bishop *Mant* has applied to the "*visitation of the Sick*," we shall as readily arrive at the same result. And is it not more becoming the true sons of the church to try to make this small portion *consistent* with the *whole*, than by forcing it back in the face of all the rest to endanger the shattering of the whole to atoms! For if Dr. Pusey has a right to put his *semi-popish* construction upon our Protestant Prayer-Book, who is to prevent future *Froudes*, *Wisemans*, or *M'Hales*, from going one step further, and placing us all in the bosom of Rome, or in the "burning fiery furnace," for our refusing "to worship the golden image which she has set up?"

#### THE PARTIES THEMSELVES.

Four authors of great exaltation, Archbishop Lawrence, Bishops Mant and Bethell, and Dr. Pusey, Divinity Professor in the University of Oxford, have all written upon the subject of baptismal regeneration, and all professedly derive much of their evidence from the same source—the Fathers of the ancient Christian Church. Though we shall not dilate, we cannot forego making one observation relative to Dr. Pusey's fundamental argument, i. e. that the whole Christian Church did for fourteen hundred years teach only "ONE SENSE" of "*water and the spirit*," and consequently only "ONE sense of baptismal regeneration." Respecting this so much vaunted argument, we might roundly assert that there is not a particle of truth or consistency in it, nor is it possible there should be.

1. The Fathers themselves *differ* from each other most materially about *what regeneration actually is*; i. e. *That*

regeneration which is *absolutely necessary* to salvation, and which (as in the Scripture) is always connected with it. Nor do we perceive that *any one of them all has given any thing like a clear, intelligible, and consistent explanation of this all-important doctrine.*

2. Hence then we see the amazing defect of judgment in placing together such an *heterogeneous mass* of authors as *veritable expositors of Scripture*, upon such an essential doctrine; and above all the recommending them as a *sure guide* to YOUNG DIVINES.

We have before seen how one set of *interpreters* of the Fathers are *opposed* to another. But our present remark goes further. The writers in the *very SAME CLASS*, which appeals to the Fathers in proof of baptismal regeneration, differ very essentially from one another about *regeneration*. We are almost tempted to ask here, "How is it then, brethren? *every one of you hath a doctrine—hath a revelation—hath an interpretation;*" but *no two have hit upon the said "one sense."* They all ascribe a regeneration to baptism. So does *Christ*, so do the *Apostles*, so do *we*, and so does the *Church* of England. But *WHAT* regeneration? is the sole question. All short of *this* is delusion. It is "*vox et preterea nihil.*"

For example, Archbishop *Lawrence* studiously avoids giving *any* proper definition of regeneration, and says that *that* is beside the question!

Bishop *Bethell* defines regeneration to be "a translation from a natural state in Adam to a spiritual state in Christ, the forgiveness of sin, adoption, a covenanted title to everlasting happiness, a new principle of spiritual life consigned over to the soul by the Holy Ghost." But this does not include "a change of heart" or a "creation or infusion of moral habits or virtues." xxiv. Pref.

The Bishop calls this "a mysterious operation of the Holy Ghost." And certainly to *us*, at least, it is quite mysterious, and unintelligible.

Professor *Pusey* is understood by Bishop *Bethell*, in Preface, page 21, to *oppose* THIS view of regeneration in page 18, where he says, our "Saviour's words refuse to be bound down to any mere outward change of state." The Bishop thinks that *his* definition escapes the Professor's reproof by its describing a change, not of "*outward,*" but of "*spiritual state;*" but forasmuch as this "*spiritual state*"

is exclusive of "*conversion, repentance, faith*, or any of the *Christian virtues*," which are properly INWARD graces, we do not see how the introduction of the term "spiritual" makes it other than an "*outward*," though "spiritual change of state."

The next Number, we hope, may show that the *Professor's* description of regeneration as well, is perfectly inconsistent with *itself*: or, in other words, that his description of it in one place is utterly subverted by his description of it in others. This confusion we do not ascribe to want of discrimination in their authors, but to the necessity of the case. His *system* could not stand, any more than that of Archbishop *Lawrence*, or that of Bishop *Bethell*, were they to *define* and abide *consistently* by ANY *definition* of regeneration, as confined to baptism!



# PLAIN TRACTS

FOR

CRITICAL TIMES.

---

THE FOLLOWING ARE NOW PUBLISHED,

*Price 4d. each.*

No. I.

REGENERATION ACCORDING TO SCRIPTURE AND  
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

No. II.

OF REGENERATION,  
ERRONEOUS INTERPRETATIONS, ETC.

*BETHELL, LAWRENCE, HOPKINS, BUDD, &c.*

No. III.

THE INSTITUTION OF BAPTISM, AND  
INTERPRETATION OF JOHN, III: 5.

*(PROFESSOR PUSEY.)*

No. IV.

THE SPIRITUAL IMPORT OF BAPTISM  
ACCORDING TO THE SCRIPTURES.

No. V.

IMPORT OF BAPTISM, OF ADULTS AND INFANTS,  
ACCORDING TO THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.









